



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

## Joint Professional Military Education Phase I Intermediate Level Course

College of Naval Command and Staff and Naval Staff College

# THEATER SECURITY DECISION MAKING

November 2024 to February 2025



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Course Overview and Policies...	03
Course Objectives...	03
Learning Outcomes...	03
Course Approach...	04
Course Organization...	04
Course Requirements...	04
Grading Standards...	07
Grade Appeals...	09
Plagiarism and the use of ChatGPT and Similar Intelligence Software...	10
Seminar Assignments and General Schedule...	10
Faculty Office Hours...	11
NSA Department Key Personnel...	11
TSDM-01: Course Introduction...	12
FPA-01: Foreign Policy Analysis for Practitioners...	13
IS-01: International Security for Practitioners...	14
FPA-2: Past and Prologue: Crisis in Lebanon...	16
IS-2: International Relations Theory I: Realism and Liberalism	17
FPA-3: Unitary State Perspective vs. Two-Level Games...	18
IS-3: International Relations Theory II: Constructivism and Feminism...	19
FPA-4: US Constitutional System...	20
IS-4: Political Economy...	21
FPA-5: Cognitive & Palace Politics Perspectives...	22
IS-5: Deterrence Theory...	23
FPA-6: The President and the White House...	24
IS-6: Strategic Deterrence...	25
FPA-7: Organizational Process and Bureaucratic Politics Perspectives...	26
IS-7: Competition for the Rules Based International Order	27
FPA-8: The National Security Bureaucracy...	28
IS-8: Strategic Challenges I: Geopolitical...	29
FPA-9: The Interagency Process...	30
IS-9: Strategic Challenges II: Transnational...	31
FPA-10: Interagency Simulation- Lorica...	32
IS-10: National Security Strategy...	33
FPA-11: Congress I: Structure, Processes & Legislative Oversight...	34
IS-11: Defense Strategy...	35
FPA-12: Congress II: Power, Polarization, and the Politics of Lawmaking...	36
IS-12: Maritime Strategy...	37
FPA-13: Media & Public Opinion...	38
IS-13: Strategic Risk I: Joint Force Employment...	39
FPA-14: External Influencers: Think Tanks, Interest Groups, and Lobbyists...	41
IS-14: Strategic Risk II: Joint Force Development and Design...	42
FPA-15: Defense Budget, Acquisitions, and Innovation	44

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

IS-15: Theater Strategy.....	46
FPA-16: Using Diplomacy... ..	48
The Regional Approach Syllabus Roadmap .....	49
IS-16: Atlantic Ocean Region: Pacific Ocean Region Foundations.....	50
IS-16: Indian Ocean Region: Atlantic Ocean Region Foundations.....	51
IS-16: Pacific Ocean Region: Indian Ocean Region Foundations... ..	52
FPA-17: Using Information... ..	53
IS-17: Atlantic Ocean Region: Indian Ocean Region Foundations.....	54
IS-17: Indian Ocean Region: Pacific Ocean Region Foundations.....	55
IS-17: Pacific Ocean Region: Atlantic Ocean Region Foundations... ..	56
FPA 18: Using Military Force... ..	57
IS-18: Atlantic Ocean Region: Atlantic Ocean Region Foundations.....	58
IS-18: Indian Ocean Region: Indian Ocean Region Foundations ... ..	59
IS-18: Pacific Ocean Region: Pacific Ocean Region Foundations ... ..	60
FPA-19: Using Economic Statecraft... ..	61
IS-19: Atlantic Ocean Region: Atlantic Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends.....	62
IS-19: Indian Ocean Region: Indian Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends .....	63
IS-19: Pacific Ocean Region: Pacific Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends ... ..	64
FPA-20: Case Study Analysis: Taiwan Scenario... ..	65
IS-20: Atlantic Ocean Region: Atlantic Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges .....	66
IS-20: Indian Ocean Region: Indian Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges ... ..	67
IS-20: Pacific Ocean Region: Pacific Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges .....	68
TSDM FX-01: Introduction, Seminar Organization, Product Development.....	69
TSDM FX-02 through FX-05: Seminar Product Development.....	71
TSDM FX-06: Seminar Phase One Presentation Review.....	73
TSDM FX-07: FX Phase Two: The Reframing Moment... ..	75
TSDM FX-08: Seminar Presentation Grading.....	77
TSDM FX-09: Course Conclusion.....	82

## THEATER SECURITY DECISION MAKING (TSDM) COURSE SYLLABUS

### 1. COURSE OVERVIEW AND POLICIES

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

**a. Course Objectives.** Our goal is to provide an educational experience that combines conceptual rigor and professional relevance to prepare students to be more effective participants in the decision-making environment of a major national security organization such as a combatant command. The intended outcome of this graduate-level course is to foster joint warfighter skills, regional awareness, strategic perspectives, critical thinking, and analytic rigor that are needed by national security professionals in command or working in a complex staff environment. This course will help skilled joint warfighters develop and execute theater military strategies that effectively employ the Armed Forces in concert with other instruments of national power to achieve the goals of national security strategy and policy in the air, land, maritime, and space physical domains and the information environment (which includes cyberspace). Our students will leave the course with:

- i. The ability to formulate and communicate assessments of a regional security environment, develop a regional strategy using all tools of national power, and identify capabilities to advance and defend national interests.
- ii. The understanding of U.S. decision making dynamics at the regional level.
- iii. The ability to assess political, budgetary, bureaucratic, organizational, and leadership factors influencing decision making and implementation of U.S. foreign policy and strategy.

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

- i. Demonstrate joint planning and joint warfighting in military operations and campaigns across the continuum of competition.
- ii. Create theater and national military strategies designed for contemporary and future security environments.
- iii. Apply the organizational and ethical concepts integral to the profession of arms to decision-making in theater-level, joint and multinational operations.

- iv. Apply theory, doctrine, and seapower through critical, structured thought in professional, written communication.

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

At the end of the course, each seminar acts as a NSC-level working group during the capstone event known as the Final Exercise (FX). Each seminar will develop an executive-level strategic estimate of the assigned ocean region over the next eight years, an outline of a regional strategy, and identify four capabilities required to advance the strategy.

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

i. TSDM (lecture and seminar)	1 Session
ii. International Security (seminars)	20 Sessions
iii. Foreign Policy Analysis (seminars)	20 Sessions
iv. Final Exercise Introductions (lectures and seminars)	1 Sessions
v. TSDM Final Exercise (FX) (course-wide capstone)	8 Sessions

**e. Course Requirements**

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

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

iii. *Essential and Recommended Readings.* All essential readings must be completed prior to class since they serve as a basis for informed and lively seminar discussion. The goal of the seminar is to discuss national security issues informed by the readings, not necessarily review each

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

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

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

<b>Sub-course</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Type Effort</b>
International Security	Paper Proposal	Written/Individual
International Security	Paper Draft	Written/Individual
Final Exercise	Seminar Presentation	Review/Seminar

vi. *Summative Assignments.* \* An overall TSDM grade will be assigned to CNCS students based on the grades earned on individual graded requirements, individual seminar preparation and contribution, and a group grade for the FX. Any collaboration between students on individual graded assignments is strictly prohibited. All graded, written student assignments for Core courses at the Naval War College will be submitted to their respective professors electronically through Turnitin Assignments set up in each Blackboard seminar course. Students may assess their papers through the Turnitin Student Workbooks in Blackboard to benefit from Turnitin's Similarity Report prior to final paper or exam submission. This will highlight for students any areas that may require additional citation, as appropriate. As students review the Turnitin report, it is important to note there is no percentage that means "all clear" and no percentage that means "big trouble." Papers with as low as a 10% similarity score may have serious plagiarism concerns while a 50% similarity score could be fine (an example is a large portion of an official document attached as an appendix). Turnitin requires students to go through the markup line by line to identify and correct any problems. When submitting papers for evaluation to professors through the Blackboard seminar course, students are still able to revise and resubmit the assignment up to the assignment deadline. For this reason, faculty will refrain from downloading or otherwise viewing any assignment submissions that come in through Turnitin assignments in their Blackboard seminar courses until the final deadline for submitting papers has passed. Students should refer any questions regarding Turnitin to their professors.

Graded assignments, due dates, and weights assigned for the overall TSDM grade are as follows:

<b>Sub-course</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Type/Basis of Evaluation</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Foreign Policy Analysis	Exam	Individual. Ability to comprehend course topics.	DEC 11	10%



International Security	Analytic Research Paper	Individual. Ability to explore in-depth a dimension of strategy and theater security. This is the only research paper of the TSDM course.	JAN 29	35%
Foreign Policy Analysis	Final Exam	Individual. Ability to apply course concepts in a logical and concise way to a case study. Time-limited assignments.	JAN 31	25%
TSDM	Seminar Preparation and Contribution*	Individual. Preparedness and individual contributions in the seminar.	Cumulative	15%
FX	Capstone Group Exercise	Seminar. Ability of seminar to apply all three sub-course concepts and present a coherent, professional presentation reflecting the seminar's theater strategic guidance.	FEB 13	15%

**\*AN IMPORTANT NOTE ON YOUR SEMINAR PREPARATION AND CONTRIBUTION GRADE.**

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

In addition to grades for individual assignments and seminar contribution, all students will receive a group grade for their seminar's performance in the TSDM FX. This grade will be determined by a three-member faculty team and assigned to the seminar as a group.

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

- Foreign Policy Analysis Exam                      07 JAN 25
- International Security Paper                        12 FEB 25

Foreign Policy Analysis Final Exam	13 FEB 25
FX Grade Assigned	13 FEB 25
TSDM Seminar Contribution Grade	Cumulative

**f. Grading Standards.** Grades for all TSDM assignments are based on the standards set forth in the *U.S. Naval War College Faculty Handbook 2024* (chapter 3, section 4), which in part states:

*“Historical evidence indicates that a grade distribution of 35%-45% ‘As’ and 55%-65% ‘Bs’ and ‘Cs’ can be expected from the overall War College student population. While variations from this norm might occur from seminar to seminar and subject to subject, it would rarely if ever be expected to reach an overall ‘A’ to ‘B/C’ ratio of greater than or equal to an even 50/50 distribution.”*

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

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

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

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



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

**A+ (97-100):** Contributions provide a wholly new understanding of the topic, expressed in a clear and concise manner. Demonstrates exceptional preparation for each session as reflected in the quality of contributions to discussions. Strikes an outstanding balance of “listening” and “contributing,” engaging with classmates in a way that elevates the overall level of seminar discourse.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alternately, the student contributes but in a manner that is dismissive of others and detracts from the overall seminar discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**h. Plagiarism and the use of ChatGPT and Similar Artificial Intelligence Software.**

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

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

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

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

Additionally, the PNWC 19 February 2023 Policy Memorandum on Permissible and Impermissible Uses of ChatGPT and other AI tools may not be used, "To produce drafts or final submissions of assignments instead of original student work. Students may not use ChatGPT or other AI tools to produce written, video, audio, or other work assigned to be developed originally and independently and submitted or presented to satisfy required coursework, regardless of whether it is graded or ungraded." The policy memorandum also states, "Students who resort to AI-generated research and writing lose the unique opportunity the NWC provides to engage deeply with issues, reflect on and analyze information, develop compelling arguments and counterarguments, and write coherent and convincing work that expands and broadens expertise. After all, that is precisely the reason why students are enrolled at NWC, and it is their primary duty."

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

**j. Faculty Office Hours.** The faculty will be available to assist in mastering the course material, to review progress, and for individual academic counseling as required. Faculty office hours also provide an excellent opportunity to review assigned tasks, to discuss general problems,

and to make recommendations for improvement of the course. Students are urged to use this opportunity. Faculty members are available throughout the week when not teaching, however, many also teach electives and perform other professional activities. Therefore, students are encouraged to arrange appointments.

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

NSA Department Chair

Dr. Derek Reveron  
Room: C-318  
Tel: 401-856-5311  
Email: derek.reveron@usnwc.edu

NSA Department Deputy Chair

Prof. Dana Struckman  
Room: C-318  
Tel: 401-856-5312  
Email: dana.struckman@usnwc.edu

NSA Department Academic Program Manager

Ms. Denise Murphy  
Room: C-315  
Tel: 401-856-5314  
Email: denise.murphy@usnwc.edu

TSDM International Security Sub-course Director

COL J.P. Maddaloni  
Room: C-313  
Tel: 401-856-5335  
Email: jon.paul.maddaloni@usnwc.edu

TSDM Foreign Policy Analysis Sub-course Director

Dr. Jessica Blankshain  
Room: C-308  
Tel: 401-856-5325  
Email: jessica.blankshain@usnwc.edu

TSDM Final Exercise (FX) Coordinator

CDR Sean Mahoney  
Room: C-304  
Tel: 401-856-5319  
Email: sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu



# TSDM - 01

## Course Introduction

### **Focus**

The National Security Affairs (NSA) department educates students in contemporary U.S. national security studies. This seven-credit hour course is focused at the theater-strategic level where students intensively evaluate regional security issues to develop theater strategy and analyze factors involved in the national security policymaking processes that influence U.S. interests in regional affairs. The final exercise challenges students to apply national strategies to advance and defend national interests in a regional context.

### **Outcomes**

- Define national security and the influences that lead to foreign policy decisions.
- Identify how strategic competition manifests at a regional level.
- Understand the course structure, assignments, and expectations.

### **Discussion Questions**

- What is a pressing national security issue in your assigned region? What are the roles and limits of national power to address this issue?
- What does strategic competition look like through a regional lens?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Video: The National Security Affairs Department USNWC. *The Debrief Episode 2*. YouTube; 2023:11:46.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K. and Derek S. Reveron, "Legacies of the Cold War and Post-Cold War Periods," Foreign Policy Research Institute, June 29, 2023 (pp. 1-9).
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K. and Derek S. Reveron, "Geography, Bureaucracy, and National Security: The New Map," Foreign Policy Research Institute, July 20, 2023 (pp. 1-9).
- "The Constitution of the United States of America." n.d. National Archives.



# FPA – 1

## Foreign Policy Analysis for Practitioners

### Focus

Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) examines various theories to explain how governments make decisions and provides an overview of the international and domestic forces that shape national security policy. U.S. governmental decision-making is the focus. This session lays out themes that will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sessions and explores the study of decision-making as a valuable way to analyze foreign policy actions. These decisions deal with a broad range of issues including going to war, negotiating a ceasefire, imposing sanctions, entering an alliance, or signing a trade agreement. This introductory session also explores why it is important for national security professionals—civilian and military — to understand foreign policy analysis and to think about the boundary between expert advice and policy advocacy.

### Outcomes

- Identify terms of art and examples of some of the more prevalent FPA models and frameworks, setting the stage for more in-depth examination in following sessions.
- Examine the uses of theory for critical thinking, strategic thinking, and creative problem-solving.
- Explore the roles of civilian and military national security professionals in the policymaking process.

### Discussion Questions

- The first reading notes 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 a foreign policy decision?
- Decision-makers inevitably must act with incomplete information. Foreign policy analysts face similar informational challenges. What information would be especially important in an FPA context? What information is easiest to come by, harder to come by, and nearly impossible to come by?
- How do you see your role in the policy process? Why is it important for you to understand how policy is made?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- The Debrief: Foreign Policy Analysis. U.S. Naval War College Video, Sept 2023.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper. "Introduction." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 1-13. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain, and David A. Cooper. "Foreign Policy Analysis." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 14-51. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Blankshain, Jessica. “A Primer on US Civil–Military Relations for National Security Practitioners.” *Wild Blue Yonder*, Air University, 6 July 2020.



# IS – 1

## IS for Practitioners

### **Focus**

The TSDM International Security sub-course prepares students to analyze and address security issues at the regional level. The sub-course is intended to provide students with an appreciation of the security environment, the sources of national power, and the importance of theater and national strategy. The sub-course will also explore the influence of international relations theory in strategy development. 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.

The Joint Concept for Competition (2023) states, “The United States finds itself in a global competition for legitimacy, credibility, and influence. National interests require the United States to shape the strategic environment to U.S. advantage and uphold a stable and open international system.” This requires analysis of U.S. foreign policy and national security in a logically coherent and consistent manner: What are U.S. interests, and how are they to be prioritized? How should the United States pursue those interests, and in what manner? What sort of world does America prefer to live in, and how important is it that the world reflect those preferences? What role does the United States play in your assigned region? Finally, how does the United States prioritize which regions of the world matter most for its national security?

### **Outcomes**

- Grasp the fundamental questions—not necessarily the answers—that a practitioner must assess when analyzing U.S. national security strategy and policy.
- Understand how national interests are conceptualized and their role in strategic thinking. For example, how do vital, important, and peripheral national interests affect a nation's strategic calculus?
- Examine the fundamental components of the international system: its major actors (especially states), rules, institutions, characteristics, functions, and challenges.
- Examine the dimensions of national power and their role in shaping strategy.
- Comprehend the fundamental components of the international system: its major actors (especially states), rules, institutions, characteristics, functions, and challenges.

### **Discussion Questions**

- What are U.S. national interests? How are they defined? How are they prioritized?
- Why is there so much difficulty determining and prioritizing national interests? Can concepts like Slaughter's “chessboard and web” or “transoceanic regions” help?
- When designing strategy, how can a country achieve balance with the various tools of national power? How can a country avoid strategic overstretch?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)**

- Reveron, Derek S. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev. "National Interests and Grand Strategy." In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, edited by Derek S. Reveron, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and John A. Cloud. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.





## IS – 1

### IS for Practitioners

---

- Sullivan, Jake. “The Sources of American Power: A Foreign Policy for a Changed World.” *Foreign Affairs*, 24 October 2023.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. “The Chessboard and the Web.” The MacMillan Report, Yale University 2015. YouTube, 15 min.
- Brands, Hal. “The Overstretched Superpower.” *Foreign Affairs*, 18 January 2022.



## FPA – 2

### Past and Prologue: Crisis in Lebanon

---

#### **Focus**

Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) is in many ways a contrast to Clausewitzian analysis since FPA introduces the complex, much less predictable world of foreign policy decision-making. One of the best ways to understand the utility of FPA is to analyze a historical case of U.S. foreign policy decision-making. It is useful to understand past decisions, as those same decisions often run down the timeline to the present. Today's foreign policy decision-makers are wrestling with the same issues as those the Reagan administration did in the Lebanon Crisis. The case also serves as a reminder that practitioners will never have all the information, resources, or time that they desire.

#### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend the complexities of FPA and the many actors and forces operate in the foreign policy decision-making domain.
- Examine how theory can be useful for the practitioner—specifically how it helps the practitioner know what questions to ask.
- Explore the strengths and limitations of using historical case studies to help us understand current policymaking dynamics.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- What factors and actors influenced the Reagan administration's decision making? How does this picture of decision-making compare to the Clausewitzian logic?
- How did decisions made early in the crisis affect decisions made later in the crisis?
- Does analyzing this historical case provide any insight into the current administration's likely policy actions in the Middle East?

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- PBS Frontline. "Retreat from Beirut." 1985.
- Gvosdev, Nick. "Case Study: Lebanon Revisited," Chapter 10 in "Navigating the Theater Security enterprise," 219-247. United States Naval War College, National Security Affairs Department.
- Mroue, Bassem. "40 years after bombing that killed Americans in Beirut, US troops again deploy east of Mediterranean," AP News, 23 Oct 2023.
- Baker, Peter. "Biden Is Not the First U.S. President to Cut Off Weapons to Israel," *The New York Times*, 10 May 2024.



## IS – 2

# International Relations Theory I: Realism and Liberalism

### Focus

Why do states do what they do? The field of International Relations (IR) revolves around answering this fundamental question, and scholars have come up with various theories to explain state behavior in international politics. In the first session of a two-part class on IR theory, we will explore the two dominant IR theories in American political science: realism and liberalism (in IS-3, we will explore theories that challenge these two paradigms). Theories try to answer questions about why things happen the way they do: Such as, why do states or sub-state groups go to war? Under what circumstances do they form alliances? Under what circumstances do they join international organizations or regimes? What determines why and how countries have conflictual or cooperative relations? Different theories propose different answers to these questions. The point is not to decide which theory is correct, but to collect from each theory the questions we can use to help understand the behavior of states.

### Outcomes

- Comprehend the main theories of how states and other actors in the international system behave. The focus here is on realism and liberalism.
- Examine how theory can be useful for the practitioner - specifically how it helps the practitioner know what questions to ask.
- Assess the uses of theory for critical thinking, strategic thinking, and creative problem-solving.

### Discussion Questions

- What do these theories say about how the world works? Where do they fundamentally (dis)agree? What policies would they propose in various situations? For example, what would a realist recommend as U.S. policy vis-à-vis China or Russia? How would a liberal's recommendations differ?
- How would we determine whether a situation is one in which realism or liberalism would be a better guide to policy?
- What questions do these theories suggest we need to ask to understand a given situation? What cause-effect questions would we want to answer to decide whose policy advice to follow?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2001. (READ Chapter 2 Anarchy and the Struggle for Power)
- Glaser, Charles L. "How to Know When You're in a Security Dilemma." *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2024.
- Keohane, Robert O. "International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?" *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1998.
- Goddard, Stacie. "The Outsiders: How the International System Can Still Check China and Russia." *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2022.
- Ikenberry, John G. "A New U.S. Grand Strategy: The Case for Liberal Internationalism." Council on Foreign Relations: The President's Inbox. 7 May 2024. Podcast, 31min.



## FPA – 3

# Unitary State Perspective vs. Two-Level Games

### Focus

This session introduces our first two analytical tools for analyzing foreign policy decision-making. The unitary state perspective conceives of states as unitary rational actors that evaluate all possible courses of action and select optimal policies based on a common, consistent, and enduring conception of the national interest. By privileging international-level factors, the unitary state perspective treats internal decision-making and its domestic political context as an impenetrable “black box.” The two-level games framework, originally developed by Robert Putnam (1988), challenges these assumptions, arguing that domestic political pressures on leaders at one level shape their ability to bargain with allies, partners, and adversaries at another level. It underscores how international-level and domestic-level factors interact to shape foreign policy outcomes. We will apply these tools to understand opportunities and constraints associated with negotiations over Iran’s nuclear program.

### Outcomes

- Comprehend key analytical tools, their utility in foreign policy analysis, and their relationship to one another. The focus here is on the unitary state perspective and the two-level games framework.
- Analyze the ways that conceptions of the national interest are politically contested and socially constructed.
- Apply FPA concepts and tools to understand a historical case and explore possible future policy choices.

### Discussion Questions

- Under what conditions do international and domestic political factors shape foreign policy?
- Who or what determines a state’s national interests? Do national interests change, or are they enduring?
- Why did the United States and Iran fail to reach a nuclear agreement in 2009-10, but succeeded in 2015?
- The unitary state perspective assumes states confronted with similar external circumstances will make similar choices, regardless of individual decision-makers and domestic political pressures. Would any U.S. president have signed the JCPOA in 2015/withdrawn from the agreement in 2018?
- What do the unitary state perspective and two-level games framework tell us about the international-level factors and domestic-level factors that will shape contemporary U.S. policy and strategy toward Iran?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Unitary State Perspective." In *Decision Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 52–87. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Domestic Politics." In *Decision Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 284–333. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. (READ 284–296 ONLY)
- Hurst, Steven. "The Iranian Nuclear Negotiations as a Two-Level Game: The Importance of Domestic Politics." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 27, no. 3 (2016): 545–559.
- Tabaar, Mohammad Ayatollahi. "Why Iran’s New President Won’t Change His Country." *Foreign Affairs*. July 16, 2024.



## IS – 3

# International Relations Theory II: Constructivism and Feminism

### Focus

This session introduces the idea of critical theory - the idea that it is important to question the assumptions of theories - through two major examples, constructivism and feminism. Constructivism questions the assumption of both realism and liberalism that meaning is mostly objective and inherent in things, arguing that the meaning of, (e.g., state behavior or a new technology) is not inherent in the thing but "constructed" through arguments, beliefs, narratives, and cultural context, and thus may vary from person to person and from one time period to another. Constructivism reminds us to ask not just what we think something means, but how other people in other contexts might understand its meaning and how that matters for our strategic thinking. Feminism questions the role of assumptions about gender (and often ideas like race, class, and nationality) in how actors understand how the world works and why things happen the way they do. The purpose is not to try to determine which of these theoretical approaches is the "right" one, but to use each of them to build a battery of questions we can ask to understand how the world works.

### Outcomes

- Comprehend the main theories of how states and other actors in the international system behave. The focus here is on constructivism and feminism.
- Examine how theory can be useful for the practitioner - specifically how it helps the practitioner know what questions to ask.
- Assess the uses of theory for critical thinking, strategic thinking, and creative problem-solving.

### Discussion Questions

- What do these theories say about how the world works? Where do they fundamentally agree/disagree? What questions would a constructivist raise about realist policy recommendations vis-à-vis China or Russia? What questions would a feminist raise about liberal policy recommendations?
- Why is critical theory particularly important for the strategist? Why isn't a problem-solving theory good enough?
- What questions do these theories suggest we need to ask to understand a given situation?
- How does using gender as a lens to analyze security, war, and peace, offer a fuller understanding of issues central to the study of international security and U.S. foreign policy?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Cox, Robert W. "Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory" in Keohane (ed) *Neorealism and its Critics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986. (READ 207-213 and 223-225)
- Hopf, Ted. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory." *International Security*, Summer 1998. (READ 171-181 and 186-196)
- Enloe, Cynthia. "Gender Makes the World Go Round: Where are the Women?" in *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*, 2014. (READ 1-13 and 28-36)
- Tickner, Ann. "Why Women Can't Run the World: International Politics According to Francis Fukuyama." *International Studies Review*, September 1999. (READ 3-11)



## FPA – 4

# U.S. Constitutional System

### Focus

The previous session examined how the domestic political system influences individual decision-makers and interacts with international factors to shape foreign policy. This session delves deeper into the specifics of the U.S. domestic system by providing a broad overview of the U.S. Constitution and its role in shaping U.S. foreign policy. It looks at how the legal structure created by the Constitution affects foreign policymaking and the roles and powers of different branches of the government. It challenges students to understand how and why the Constitution creates “an invitation to struggle” over foreign policy, as well as their own role in the system.

### Outcomes

- Comprehend the formal institutions that comprise the U.S. government and their relationship to the U.S. Constitution.
- Analyze how the constitutional system both constrains and enables U.S. foreign policy.
- Apply your understanding of the constitutional system to a case study.

### Discussion Questions

- What responsibilities and powers does each branch of the U.S. government have, as defined in the Constitution, and how do they affect national security decision-making?
- How has the Constitution been interpreted to facilitate the modern U.S. national security system? How do these dynamics affect the organizations in which you serve?
- What constitutional issues were at stake during the Iran-Contra affair?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- Knott, Steven. “The Founding Fathers, The U.S. Constitution, and Its Founding Principles.” Lecture of Opportunity, Video Recorded at the U.S. Naval War College, August 21, 2018. (WATCH 18:50-47:58 ONLY)
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. “Domestic Politics.” In *Decision Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 284–333. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. (READ 296–312 ONLY)
- Koh, Harold Hongju. *The National Security Constitution in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2024. (READ 9-15 and 59-91 ONLY)
- Breyer, Stephen. “Silence: Cicero and His ‘Political Questions’ Counterpart.” In *The Court and the World: American Law and the New Global Realities*, 15–24. New York: Vintage Books, 2016.
- Barbash, Fred. “Justice Department opinions take on the force of law — but are not, in fact, the law.” *The Washington Post*, May 31, 2019.



## IS – 4

# Political Economy

### Focus

While this course is focused on security issues and decision-making, it is important to remember that most states, most of the time, do not face existential threats and are equally or more concerned with their economic health. Moreover, economic activity can constitute a basis for either conflict or conflict resolution, and a state's economy is the main factor in its ability to use either coercion or incentives in international bargaining. Thus, it is critical to understand the basics of how economic systems work and interact, how states use/counter economic power, and the relationships between economics and security politics. As you think more about this topic, pay attention to the linkages to the two-level games analytic tool.

### Outcomes

- Understand basic concepts like market structure, fiscal and monetary policies, free trade vs. protectionism, and collective action problems.
- Understand the basic structure and institutions of the international economic system, including processes of globalization and de-globalization.
- Understand how economic power is formed and used and learn to analyze its likely effects.
- Learn to incorporate the relationships between political and economic systems into strategic thinking.

### Discussion Questions

- States choose whether their economy will serve the state's interests or whether state security serves economic interests, or some balance of the two. What are the pluses and minuses of each approach? How does this essentially domestic political decision translate into foreign policy?
- How do states pursue economic power? What are the respective roles of cooperation and competition in the international system? Why isn't it purely competitive?
- Most observers see the world as becoming more multipolar, especially in economic terms. What do you think this means, and what can/should the U.S. strategy be going forward?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Cohn, Lindsay P. "Introduction to Political Economy" Naval War College. National Security Affairs Department, 2024.
- Ripsman, Norrin M, Rosella Cappella Zielinski, and Kaija E Schilde. "The Political Economy of Security." In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L Newman. "Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion." *International Security* 44, no.1 (2019): 42–79.
- Boocker, Sam, and David Wessel. "The Changing Role of the U.S. Dollar." Brookings. 23 Aug 2024.
- Freymann, Eyck and Hugo Bromley. On Day One: An Economic Contingency Plan for a Taiwan Crisis. Naval War College lecture, 23 Sep 2024. Panopto Video, 15min. (WATCH from 4:05 to 19:50)
- Wade, Robert H. "The 2024 G20 Rio de Janeiro Summit: high stakes, high drama." London School of Economics European Politics and Policy Blog, 21 Jun 2024.
- Pitron, Guillaume. "The Geopolitics of the Rare-Metals Race," *Washington Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (2022): 135-150.





## FPA – 5

### Cognitive and Palace Politics Perspectives

#### **Focus**

This session introduces the cognitive and palace politics perspectives for analyzing foreign policy decision-making, expanding the toolkit introduced in FPA-3. It focuses on how individual-level factors and small-group dynamics influence the decision-making process. It looks at how personality traits, beliefs, cognitive biases, and past experiences can affect how leaders act and are perceived. It also addresses how formal and informal advisors compete for access and influence in the policymaking process.

#### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend key analytical tools, their utility in foreign policy analysis, and their relationship to one another. The focus here is on the cognitive and palace politics perspectives.
- Apply FPA concepts and tools to real world examples of foreign policy decision-making.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- How can you recognize cognitive factors and palace politics factors at work in individual decision-making processes?
- How do you differentiate between the palace politics and cognitive perspectives?
- How might leader-level attributes (personality, style, beliefs, etc.) influence how a leader engages with advisors and other political actors?
- How do these new perspectives affect your understanding of cases (e.g., Lebanon) that we've encountered in the course thus far?

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Cognitive Perspective." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 88-124. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Palace Politics Perspective." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 192-237. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Saunders, Elizabeth. "Mitch McConnell thinks you don't need experience to be president. Here's why he's wrong." *The Washington Post* Monkey Cage Blog, 27 July 2016.



## IS – 5

# Deterrence Theory

### **Focus**

Deterrence is the use of threats and assurances to convince an adversary that the costs of taking an action are greater than the possible benefits. Deterrence has a long history as a strategy used by people and governments to manage and prevent conflict, but in recent years, practicing deterrence is complicated by a threat environment that has a more complex array of threats, new domains such as cyber and space, and broader range of actors. This session will examine the fundamental concepts of deterrence theory, the challenges to implementing a successful deterrent strategy, and how the theory is applied in practice.

### **Outcomes**

- Understand the basic concepts of deterrence and assurance in the 21st century security environment.
- Apply deterrence by-denial and by-punishment to national strategy implementation.
- Examine and evaluate the usefulness of integrated deterrence along with its application in the cyber and space domains.

### **Discussion Questions**

- What are the basic concepts of deterrence and how does a state construct a credible deterrence commitment? What role does rationality play in deterrence calculations?
- What are the challenges for states to “extend” deterrence to protect allies?
- What is the best way to deter a Chinese invasion of Taiwan?
- What is “integrated deterrence” and is it a useful way to think of deterrence? How will deterrence concepts apply to the domains of space and cyberspace? If not, why not?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)**

- Biddle, Tami Davis. “Coercion Theory: A Basic Introduction for Practitioners,” *Texas National Security Review* 3, no. 2 (Spring 2020): 94-109.
- Schelling, Thomas C. *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966. (READ Chapter 2 The Art of Commitment 35-59)
- Sacks, David and Ivan Kanapathy. “What It Will Take to Deter China in the Taiwan Strait,” *Foreign Affairs*, 15 June 2023.
- Mazarr, Michael J. and Ivana Ke. “Integrated Deterrence as a Defense Planning Concept,” RAND, June 2024. (READ 1-26)



## FPA – 6

# The President and the White House

### **Focus**

This session follows up on the introduction of the cognitive and palace politics perspectives by having students apply these perspectives to their understanding of the inner workings of the White House. Policy-making can rapidly change because of a variety of cognitive factors, personalities, informal relationships, rivalries, and other human factors in any given administration. Understanding how individuals within the White House gain access to and interact with the president can help explain policy outcomes. Additionally, the president is constrained by the domestic political system, complicated by the need to simultaneously consider his or her domestic policy goals.

### **Outcomes**

- Explore the ways in which U.S. presidents are and are not constrained in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy.
- Comprehend how individual president's personalities, emotions, priorities, and cognitive frames influence decision-making processes and outcomes.
- Examine the role of the White House Staff in shaping the policy process.

### **Discussion Questions**

- To what extent do presidents and their advisors matter in U.S. national security decision-making?
- How do White House advisors compete for access and influence? What determines their levels of success?
- How do the decision-making processes of different administrations reflect the preferences or personalities of the president?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Harvard Kennedy School Institute of Politics. Forum, "Gatekeepers: The White House Chief of Staff." September 12, 2017 (WATCH to 45:00)
- Stieb, Joseph. "Rethinking Gore-War: Counterfactuals and the 2003 Iraq War." *Journal of Strategic Studies*, October 2023, 1-30.
- Bator, Francis. "No Good Choices: LBJ and the Vietnam/Great Society Connection." *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 3 (June 2008); 309-340.
- Klein, Ezra. "The Green Lantern Theory of the Presidency Explained," *Vox*, 20 May 2014.



## IS – 6

# Strategic Deterrence

### Focus

The United States was the first country 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. In the years following the Cold War, both civilian and military analysts gave far less thought to nuclear weapons and nuclear deterrence as the threat of an existential nuclear conflict appeared to recede. Over the past decade, however, the nuclear question was resurfaced, not only because of increased competition with China and Russia, but also because of North Korea's advancing nuclear capabilities, and ongoing concern over a potential Iranian nuclear weapons program.

### Outcomes

- Comprehend the role strategic deterrence plays in the defense and advancement of U.S. national interests.
- Understand the dynamics of strategic deterrence escalation management.
- Examine and assess the structure of the U.S. nuclear force and the plans to modernize these weapons systems.
- Understand and assess the role strategic deterrence might play in future international conflict.

### Discussion Questions

- Should the size, composition, and capability of certain parts of the U.S. nuclear force be adjusted?
- How will deterrence be affected by the emerging multipolar nuclear security environment?
- What are the causes and implications of Chinese nuclear expansion and modernization for U.S. and global security? How should the U.S. respond if it now has two peer nuclear adversaries?
- What are the escalation dynamics between the players in the conflict in Ukraine? What lessons should be learned from the Ukraine conflict regarding deterrence and escalation in future wars? What are the implications for nuclear non-use norms should Russia use nuclear weapons?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Fink, Anya L. *Defense Primer: Strategic Nuclear Forces*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 19 July 2024.
- Talmadge, Caitlin. "Multipolar Deterrence in the Emerging Nuclear Era," Chapter 1 in Vipin Narang and Scott D. Sagan (eds), *The Fragile Balance of Terror: Deterrence in the New Nuclear Age*. Cornell University Press, 2023.
- Talmadge, Caitlin and Joshua Rovner. "The Meaning of China's Nuclear Modernization." *Journal of Strategic Studies* (May 2023): 1-33.
- Eliason, William T. "An Interview with Anthony J. Cotton," *Joint Forces Quarterly*, February 15, 2024.
- Frederick, Bryan, Mark Cozad, and Alexandra Stark. "Understanding the Risk of Escalation in the War in Ukraine," RAND, September 21, 2023.
- The NSA Debrief Episode 6: "Contemplating the Unthinkable: Making Nuclear Deterrence Credible." U.S. Naval War College, 2023. YouTube, 26 min.



## FPA – 7

# Organizational Process and Bureaucratic Politics Perspectives

### **Focus**

This session introduces the organizational and bureaucratic politics perspectives for analyzing foreign policy decision-making, expanding the toolkit introduced in FPA-3 and FPA-5. The organizational process perspective draws attention to organizations as habitual actors—each with its own legal basis, mission, culture, and structure—who systematically process information and produce organizational outputs in the form of options and lower-level actions. The bureaucratic politics perspective, on the other hand, focuses on organizations as strategic actors represented by people in positions. Bargaining among senior leaders of organizations—who push for policies that protect and promote the core interests of their specific agency or department—often results in compromises among competing bureaucratic interests.

### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend key analytical tools, their utility in foreign policy analysis, and their relationship to one another. The focus here is on the cognitive and palace politics perspectives.
- Apply FPA concepts and tools to a case study linked to IS concepts of nuclear deterrence.

### **Discussion Questions**

- How do different cultures and sub-cultures impact the way 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 do bureaucratic interests overlap with, and diverge from, the national interest?
- What are the sources of bureaucratic bargaining power?
- How does understanding the organizational process and bureaucratic politics perspectives affect your understanding of nuclear deterrence?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper. "Organizational Process Perspective." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 125–160. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Gvosdev, Nikolas K., Jessica D. Blankshain and David A. Cooper, "Bureaucratic Politics Perspective." In *Decision-Making in American Foreign Policy: Translating Theory into Practice*, 162-191. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Sagan, Scott Douglas. "The Perils of Proliferation: Organization Theory, Deterrence Theory, and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons." *International Security* 18:4 (1994) 66–107.



## IS – 7

# Competition for the Rules Based International Order

### Focus

The strength of the United States resides not just in its economy and military but also in the entire international system built after World War Two. This rules-based international order created institutions and norms to govern diplomacy, economics and security worldwide. Because it has been so effective at maximizing U.S. and Western power, it is currently a source of contention with China, which argues the system does not operate fairly and wishes to put forward an alternative. It is also being criticized by members of the global south, who feel it operates to their detriment, and would like significant changes made.

### Outcomes

- Understand what's at stake in competition to shape the future international order.
- Analyze the rules based international order for U.S. national interests and values.
- Identify key areas that the U.S. can offer for a better value proposition in the international system.

### Discussion Questions

- What compromises the rules based international order?
- What is the role of the United States in the international order?
- What are the principal challenges facing the rules based international order?
- You examined the major theories of international relations in IS-2 and IS-3. How do those theories inform the readings for this session?
- How do developing countries view strategic competition between the United States and Russia and China?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Ikenberry, G. John. "Why American Power Endures: The U.S.-Led Order Isn't in Decline." *Foreign Affairs* 101, no. 6, 2022.
- Bunde, Tobias, Sophie Eisentraut, Natalie Knapp, Leonard Schütte, Julia Hammelehle, Isabell Kump, Amadée Mudie-Mantz, and Jintro Pauly. *Munich Security Report 2023: Re:vision*. Munich: Munich Security Conference, February 2023. (READ Introduction: Re:vision and 14-36)
- Economy, Elizabeth. "China's Alternative Order: And What America Should Learn from It." *Foreign Affairs* 103, no.8, 2024.
- Spektor, Matias. "In Defense of the Fence Sitters: What the West Gets Wrong About Hedging." *Foreign Affairs* 102, no.8, 2023.
- Murithi, Tim. "Order of Oppression: Africa's Quest for a New International System." *Foreign Affairs*. 102, no.8, 2023.



## FPA – 8

# The National Security Bureaucracy

### Focus

This session follows up on the introduction of the organizational process and bureaucratic politics perspectives by applying these perspectives to the inner workings of the U.S. national security bureaucracy. National security in any country is a vast enterprise. For the United States, with the largest security budget in the world, the government apparatus devoted to national security is sprawling. This session explores key bureaucratic actors in the U.S. national security enterprise, exploring their missions, structures, and cultures. Students have an opportunity to research a specific non-DoD agency and explore that agency's role in formulating national security policy.

### Outcomes

- Comprehend the major players in the United States national security bureaucracy.
- Analyze the similarities and differences between various departments and agencies and how this might affect their approach to national security policy.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the major elements of the U.S. national security apparatus, and what are their roles?
- For the department or agency assigned to you by your faculty members, what is the organizational essence of the agency? What component of its essence gives it the most power?
- How do these bureaucracies wield power and what events might change the power dynamics?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- Congressional Research Service. "Defense Primer: The Department of Defense." Mar 13, 2024.
- Congressional Research Service. "U.S. Trade Policy Functions: Who Does What?" Jan 14, 2022.
- Congressional Research Service. "Defense Primer: National and Defense Intelligence." Apr 22, 2024.
- Davidson, Janine. "Civil - Military Friction and Presidential Decision Making: Explaining the Broken Dialogue." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 43, no. 1 (September 2023): 129 – 145.
- Eaglen, Mackenzie. "Putting Combatant Commanders on a Demand Signal Diet." *War on the Rocks*, Nov 9, 2020.
- Your professor will assign you an agency to represent in FPA-10 Interagency Simulation. Research this agency's mission, structure, and culture in preparation for seminar discussion. Relevant chapters from George and Rishikof *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth* are provided as a starting point.
  - Grossman, Mark. "The State Department: Culture as Interagency Destiny?" pp. 81 – 96.
  - McMillan, Joseph and Franklin C. Miller "The Office of the Secretary of Defense," pp. 120 – 141.
  - Meese, Michael J. and Isaiah Wilson III. "The Military: Forging a Joint Warrior Culture," pp. 142 – 161.
  - Temple-Raston, Dina and Harvey Rishikof, "The Department of the Treasury: Brogues on the Ground," pp. 162 – 182.
  - Fingar, Thomas, "Office of the Director of National Intelligence: From Pariah and Pinata to Managing Partner," pp. 185 – 203.





## IS – 8

### Strategic Challenges I: Geopolitical

#### Focus

This session will consider the two principal geopolitical challenges for the United States: China and Russia. This session provides an overview of Washington's perspective in general terms regarding Beijing and Moscow's respective worldviews, intentions, and policies. Emphasis will be placed on Chinese and Russian perspectives to appreciate strategic competition among Washington, Moscow, and Beijing.

#### Outcomes

- Analyze China's national-security objectives and worldview from a Chinese perspective.
- Analyze Russia's national-security objectives and worldview from a Russian perspective.
- Evaluate the ongoing debate over how the United States should engage with China and Russia, drawing on various International Relations theories and their assumptions.

#### Discussion Questions

- What does China want? A world in which it has displaced the United States as the most powerful country? Mere hegemony in the Asia-Pacific? What evidence would you want to see to determine China's intentions? What will the relationship between ambitions and capabilities be for China?
- What does Russia want? A geographically limited sphere of influence for itself? Or a more comprehensive change in the international order? What evidence would you want to see to determine Russia's intentions? What will the relationship between ambitions and capabilities be for Russia?
- How should we think about Chinese and Russian foreign-policy behavior over the past decade? How successful have their actions been in advancing their agendas? What mistakes have they made? What mistakes has the United States made in its engagement with these two powers? Should we think of each power as a resurgent power that will continue to rise, as a power (soon to be) on the decline that is seeking to consolidate interests now, or something else?

#### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. *Annual Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community*. Washington, DC: 2024. (READ 7-17)
- Shirk, Susan L. *Overreach: How China Derailed Its Peaceful Rise*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2023. (READ 207-240 and 369-379)
- The NSA Debrief Episode 11: "The China Challenge." U.S. Naval War College, 2024. YouTube, 35 min.
- International Institute for Strategic Studies. "Plenary Session 5: China's Approach to Global Security." June 2, 2024. (READ or WATCH both Admiral Dong Jun's speech and the question-and-answer session)
- Putin, Vladimir. Prepared remarks at 43<sup>rd</sup> Munich Conference on Security Policy, Munich, Germany, February 10, 2007.
- Snegovaya, Maria, Michael Kimmage, and Jade McGlynn. "Putin the Ideologue: The Kremlin's Potent Mix of Nationalism, Grievance, and Mythmaking." *Foreign Affairs*, November 16, 2023.



## FPA – 9

# The Interagency Process

### Focus

This session explores the interagency process as driven from the Executive Office of the President (EOP). The Joint Staff's Guide for Interagency Doctrine describes the purpose of the interagency process as advancing the President's policy priorities. To that end, this process ensures all departments and agencies can participate in formulating the President's policy and seeks consensus that is crucial for policy implementation. This session (1) introduces the National Security Council (NSC) as the convening authority for interagency coordination, (2) further explores the actors and institutions introduced in FPA-6 (The President & The White House) and FPA-8 (The National Security Bureaucracy), and (3) reinforces the explanatory power of the analytical perspectives introduced in FPA-3, FPA-5, and FPA-7.

### Outcomes

- Understand the role of the NSC and the NSC staff in the interagency process.
- Analyze the factors that drive the interagency process in coordinating, formulating, and executing policy.
- Examine a historical case of one administration's NSC, NSC staff, and interagency process.

### Discussion Questions

- What is the purpose of the interagency process? Does that purpose present inherent tensions?
- How does the interagency process demonstrate the consensus nature of the U.S. government?
- What is the role of the NSC staff? What are the characteristics of a successful or unsuccessful NSC staff in advancing the President's policy priorities?
- Where does interagency coordination occur outside Washington?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- Cloud, John A. and Nikolas K. Gvosdev. "A Very Slim Reed: From the Phrases of the Constitution to the Theater Security Enterprise." In *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, 25–57. Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2018.
- Gagliano, Joseph. "The White House." In *Naval Officer's Guide to the Pentagon*, ed. Fred W. Kacher and Douglas A. Robb, 186-203. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2019. (**READ 188-199 ONLY** – Stop at "White House Military Office")
- Gans, John. "The President's 'Personal Band of Warriors.'" In *White House Warriors: How the National Security Council Transformed the American Way of War*, John Gans, 1-10. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, a division of W. W. Norton & Company, 2019.
- Rothkopf, David J. "Across a Bright Line in History." In *Running the World: The Inside Story of the National Security Council and the Architects of American Power*, David Rothkopf, 260-302. New York: PublicAffairs, 2005.

### Additional Resources

- Rollins, John. *The National Security Council: Background and Issues for Congress*, Report Number R44828. Washington, Congressional Research Service, 2022.



## IS – 9

# Strategic Challenge II: Transnational

### Focus

Hyper-connectivity has created numerous opportunities for states and non-state actors to interact but also given rise to emergent transnational and non-traditional security issues that cannot be solved solely through military force. Transnational challenges include: organized crime, trafficking, terrorism, disease, natural disasters, climate change, extreme weather events, refugees, corruption, illegal fishing, piracy, hackers, cyberspace, energy, multinational corporations. Such nonmilitary threats share three features: (1) do not always involve state actors, (2) nature of threats that cross borders, and (3) necessitate cooperation among different actors for a coordinated response. Transnational security issues can threaten the stability of the international system and test the sovereignty and resilience of each state.

### Outcomes

- Identify and analyze non-traditional security threats that will shape the future of the international system.
- Assess how states have responded to transnational issues and implications for global stability.
- Identify future transnational security challenges to states and the international system.

### Discussion Questions

- What non-traditional security threats will likely shape the future of the international system and various regions? How can non-state actors affect state security?
- In what ways can the military be used to respond to transnational issues? What resilience strategies should countries develop to prepare their society in coordinating responses to non-traditional security problems?
- How does climate change and extreme weather impact the U.S. national interests?
- What are the expenses, dangers, risks, and costs associated with non-traditional threats? What are the barriers to states effectively dealing with these issues?
- How can states, such as the United States, cooperate with adversarial states (e.g., China, Russia, etc.) in an era of strategic competition to address non-traditional security issues?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. *Annual Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community*. Washington, DC: 2024. (READ 30-40)
- Hellmuth, Molly E., et. al. Chapter 17 Climate Effects on US International Interests. In: *Fifth National Climate Assessment*. U.S. Global Change Research Program. Washington, DC: 2023. (READ 17-4 to 17-12)
- Apling, Scott C., et. al. "Pivoting the Joint Force: National Security Implications of Illegal, Unregulated, and Unreported Fishing." *Joint Force Quarterly* 47, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter (2022): 93-101.
- Clarke, Colin P. "Trends in Terrorism: What's on the Horizon in 2024?" *Foreign Policy Research Institute*, 2023.
- Faulkner, C., et al. "Russia's Mercenary-Industrial Complex in Africa." *War on the Rocks*, 2024.
- 2023 White House Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime. The White House. Washington, DC: 2023. (READ 3-12)



# FPA - 10

## Interagency Simulation - Lorica

### **Focus**

In this fictional scenario, it is May 24, 2024. James Walker, the President of the United States of America, is in the White House. He has recently learned that part of the island of Lorica—a Pacific possession of Venezuela that lies between the coast of California and Hawaii—has been leased by the People’s Republic of China for use as an air and naval base. He has asked the North Pacific Interagency Working Group, part of the National Security Council, to generate policy recommendations within hours. You are a representative of an Executive Branch agency on the NPIWG, tasked with considering the national security interests of the United States as well as your agency’s insights and priorities. After consulting the background materials on Lorica and recent updates, your task is to work with the interagency working group to supply the president with urgently needed policy advice.

### **Outcomes**

- Understand how bureaucratic perspectives shape views of an evolving situation.
- Analyze a hypothetical regional security development and associated policy choices.
- Apply your knowledge of FPA concepts and tools to an in-class simulation.

### **Discussion Questions**

- How do agency representatives think about their bureaucratic interests in the context of the national interest?
- How do agency representatives interpret senior guidance, especially when faced with conflicting guidance?
- As a representative of your agency, which policy option do you recommend and why?
- Which other NPIWG participants do you expect to agree with your recommendation? Which do you expect will oppose it?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Video instructions to the interagency working group – Dr. Jane Stanton, NSC
- Student Guide to the Lorica Simulation
- Lorica Simulation – background and crisis materials
- Your role description and private information – distributed hardcopy, or by email, by your FPA faculty



## IS – 10

# National Security Strategy

### **Focus**

Congress requires the President to submit several strategy documents that serve many purposes. They are designed to create internal coherence on foreign and defense policy within the Executive Branch and provide a basis for Congress to fund defense priorities. The President's National Security Strategy (NSS), required by Section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433), is intended to outline the administration's strategic vision and approximate grand strategy, detailing major security concerns and how the administration plans to use the instruments of national power to address them. For this session, it is important to reconsider earlier discussions on power, interests, challenges, and strategic approaches.

### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend the purpose of national strategic guidance documents throughout history and how current strategies define U.S. national interests.
- Examine the coordination among the ends, ways, and means of the NSS.
- Assess how well the current U.S. administration is performing on their strategy and use these observations for the Final Exercise (FX) when students will create their own strategy.

### **Discussion Questions**

- What different purposes do national strategy documents serve? How do they function as a strategic communications tool for various domestic and international audiences? How well does the Executive Branch follow the strategic guidance laid out in these documents? What utility do they provide to Congress?
- What are national interests and why are they important? How does the NSS define the primary (vital) national interests of the United States and what concepts does it include to address them?
- How well does the 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?
- Included in the readings are two de-classified documents addressing American strategy toward the Indo-Pacific/Far East. One is from 2020, while the other is from 1954. How do the prose and tone of these strategies differ from the current NSS? Does classification matter?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)**

- Chin, John J., Kiron Skinner, and Clay Yoo. "Understanding National Security Strategies Through Time." *Texas National Security Review* 6, no. 4 (2023).
- U.S. President. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, DC: White House, 2022.
- Kennan, George F. "The Inauguration of Organized Political Warfare," 30 April 1948.
- *U.S. Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific*, declassified Trump Administration strategy. (SCAN)
- NSC 5429/5 *Current U.S. Policy Toward the Far East*, December 22, 1954, (declassified), *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954, East Asia and the Pacific, Volume XII, Part 1*. (SCAN)



## FPA 11

# Congress I: Structure, Processes & Legislative Oversight

### **Focus**

As lawmakers in a rule-of-law-based society, Congress plays a fundamental role in national security decision-making, although its influence has tended to wax and wane with respect to the Executive Branch. How and why does Congress impact U.S. foreign and national security policy today, and how has its role changed over time? What powers, authorities, and influence does Congress wield, and in what issues and areas is Congress more or less involved and why? How does Congress' structure and processes affect policy decisions in the Department of Defense, including how the defense budget is decided? This session will delve into the practical aspects of legislating and its impacts and influence on U.S. national security policy as well as the impacts the national-level Legislative-Executive interactions can have on theater strategic endeavors.

### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend how the legislative process shapes U.S. foreign policy and national security decision-making, with a particular focus on the budget process.
- Examine how Congress influences policy through its oversight of the executive branch broadly, and military specifically.
- Understand Congressional perspectives, interest, and involvement on decisions involving national security and foreign policy.

### **Discussion Questions**

- How do Congress' Article I Constitutional powers impact its role in matters of foreign policy and national security? When does Congress get involved and, when it does, what powers, tools, and authorities does Congress have to direct or influence policy?
- Where in Congress is power and influence located, how is it manifested and demonstrated, and how do these powers affect legislation?
- How does Congress influence foreign policy through its oversight powers? Is the conventional wisdom that Congress does little real oversight correct?
- How does Congress shape foreign policy through the power of the purse?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Debrief: "Congress: Your Partner in National Security." U.S. Naval War College Video, Sept 2023.
- "The Legislative Process: Overview (Video)". Congress.gov.
- Towell, Pat. "Congress and Defense." Chapter 4 in *Congress and the Politics of National Security*, David P. Auerswald and Colton C. Campbell, eds. Cambridge UP, 2012, pp. 71-99.
- "Defense Primer: The NDAA Process". In Focus, Congressional Research Service, February 1, 2024.
- Demarest, Heidi. "The Role of Congress". Chapter 3 In *Resourcing the National Security Enterprise*. Susan Bryant and Mark Troutman, eds. Cambria Press, 2022. 33-51.



# IS – 11

## Defense Strategy

### Focus

The National Security, Defense, and Military Strategies provide strategic guidance for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) who uses this guidance to execute his six primary functions identified in Section 153 of Title 10, U.S. Code. This lesson focuses on the NDS and NMS, as well as security cooperation.

### Outcomes

- Identify and analyze major directions of current U.S. defense strategic direction. This includes the National Defense Strategy (NDS), National Military Strategy (NMS), geographic and ally prioritization, integrated deterrence, campaigning, and strategic discipline.
- Understand the general process through which strategic guidance provided in the NSS, NDS, and NMS is used to inform and drive force planning.
- Consider how security cooperation activities advance and defend U.S. interests.

### Discussion Questions

- Do the 2022 NDS and NMS adequately guide the Department of Defense for the future?
- How well do the 2022 NDS and NMS hold up to actual events since their release?
- What do the NDS and NMS have to say about your assigned region?
- Do you agree with Cordesman's view of the NDS's shortcomings with respect to force planning? If so, how would you change the NDS?
- The NDS holds security cooperation as a key principle, yet the RAND report finds U.S. security cooperation efforts are "somewhat misaligned to the demands of the strategic competition;" how do you assess the effectiveness of U.S. security cooperation?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- The NWC Talks: "Military Partnerships with Professor Derek Reveron." U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube video, 11 min.
- 10 USC § 113.g. (2024).
- U.S. Department of Defense. *The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, DC: Secretary of Defense, 2022. (READ III-IV and 1-23)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *The National Military Strategy of the United States of America: Strategic Discipline*. Washington, DC: CJCS, 2022.
- Cordesman, Anthony W. "The New U.S. National Defense Strategy for 2022." *Center for Strategic and International Studies*, October 28, 2022.
- Thomas G. Mahnken, "A Three-Theater Defense Strategy." *Foreign Affairs*, June 5, 2024.
- Mazarr, Michael J, Nathan Beauchamp-Mustafaga, Jonah Blank, Samuel Charap, Michael S Chase, Beth Grill, Derek Grossman, Dara Massicot, Jennifer D. P Moroney, and Lyle J Morris. "Security Cooperation in a Strategic Competition." *RAND Corporation*, 2022. (READ v-vi, 85-90, and SCAN 1-25)





## FPA – 12

# Congress II: Power, Polarization, and the Politics of Lawmaking

### **Focus**

Beyond its formal institutions and authorities, Congress shapes foreign and defense policy through the politics of lawmaking. Congressional rules and procedures confer considerable influence on the political parties holding the majority of seats in the Senate and House of Representatives, empowering majority party leaders to set the legislative agenda, appoint committee chairs, and shape the voting behavior of individual legislators. Under some conditions, these rules enable minority party members to block legislation, presidential appointments, and treaties, making negotiation, deal-making, and compromise essential features of Congressional functioning. Although legislators often vote along party lines, bipartisan majorities of Congress will sometimes act in ways that challenge a president's foreign policies. This session will consider how the politics of Congress shape legislative-executive relations and the making of foreign and defense policy, from the creation of a new military service branch to the passage of foreign security assistance packages to U.S. allies and partners. This session will also explore how recent trends in divided government, partisan polarization, and divisions within political parties are shaping fundamental debates and perceptions of American foreign and security policy.

### **Outcomes**

- Understand how the politics of lawmaking in Congress shapes foreign and defense policies.
- Analyze the ways in which congressional action (or inaction) can empower or constrain the authority and discretion of the executive branch to shape and implement foreign and security policy.
- Explore whether and how recent trends in divided government, partisan polarization, and intra-party divisions among partisan factions are shaping debates over American foreign policy and grand strategy.

### **Discussion Questions**

- How does the authority conferred on party leaders in Congress influence lawmaking in foreign policy?
- How does Congress influence the foreign policy choices of the executive, even in the absence of action?
- How has growing polarization and increasing rates of divided government shaped American foreign policy?
- Congress adopted both the 2019 NDAA creating the U.S. Space Force and the 2024 security assistance package to Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan during periods of divided government. How did Congressional leaders navigate the legislative hurdles within and across both major parties to achieve these outcomes?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- The Debrief, Season 2, Episode 1. "Bipartisanship and Foreign Policy: How Congress Cooperates in a Polarized Age." Naval War College Video, May 2024.
- Schultz, Kenneth. "Perils of Polarization for U.S. Foreign Policy." *Washington Quarterly*, 40:4 (2017), 7–28.
- Burbach, David. "Launching From Capitol Hill: Congress and the Creation of U.S. Space Force." Naval War College Case Study. Fall 2024.
- Caldwell, Leigh Ann, and Marianna Sotomayor. "The Evolution of Mike Johnson on Ukraine." *The Washington Post*. April 21, 2024.



# IS – 12

## Maritime Strategy

### Focus

The sea is a natural resource and an efficient medium for high-volume trade. There is a close relationship between seapower and economic prosperity that highlights the importance of maritime supremacy. This session will consider the current maritime security environment, including traditional military threats and non-traditional challenges to the international rules-based system that the United States might confront. Students should think about strategies to respond to those challenges, at the level of the National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy, and theater plans. They also should consider the interests and capabilities of other maritime nations.

### Outcomes

- Examine traditional and non-traditional maritime security challenges.
- Assess future and emerging challenges in the maritime domain.
- Analyze maritime strategy documents and their suitability for the maritime security environment.
- Comprehend the Navy's contribution to the Joint Force toward ends defined in the National Security Strategy, National Defense Strategy, and National Military Strategy.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the maritime interests of the United States?
- What departments and agencies have equities in the maritime domain? Non-government organizations? Commercial entities?
- What are the current challenges facing maritime strategists? How are those challenges different from those confronting maritime strategists five or ten years ago?
- What is the "golden thread" from the NSS to the NDS to the NMS to JP-1 to the Chief of Naval Operations Navigation Plan (NAVPLAN) to the Nav's Distributed Maritime Operations (DMO) concept? Where do they fail to connect?
- What are the limitations of service-specific strategies in a post-Goldwater-Nichols Joint Force?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Hattendorf, John B. "What is a Maritime Strategy?" *Soundings*, no. 1 (October 2013): 1-10.
- Till, Geoffrey. *Seapower: A Guide for the Twenty-First Century*, 1-31. London: Routledge, 2018.
- U.S. Navy, *Chief of Naval Operations Navigation Plan for America's Warfighting Navy*. 2024.
- O'Rourke, Ronald. "Defense Primer: Navy Distributed Maritime Operations (DMO) Concept." Washington: Congressional Research Service. 3 July 2024, 1-2.
- The NWC Talks: "China and the Law of the Sea with James Kraska." U.S. Naval War College, 2020. YouTube video, 13 min.
- U.S. Department of Defense. "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China." Washington. 2023. (READ 1-7, 17-19, 25-27, 52-59, and 79-82)
- U.S. Navy, *Navy Force Planning and Design, 1933-2019*. Washington: Naval History and Heritage Command. 2024. (READ 107-111)



## FPA – 13

### Media & Public Opinion

---

#### **Focus**

Mass media and public opinion have the potential to significantly influence the policymaking process. But they can also influence each other, and in turn be influenced by policy elites. The relationship among these entities can be contentious: How much do elected leaders follow vs. lead the opinions of those they represent? How can we characterize the relationship between the military and the media? When is the American public more or less likely to support U.S. military action abroad? How does the fragmentation of news and the rise of social media affect the spread of information and misinformation to the public? In this session you will explore some of these debates and consider the roles of the media and public opinion in the policymaking process.

#### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend the interactive effects of media coverage and public opinion on national and theater security decision-making processes.
- Discuss the impact of media coverage and disinformation/misinformation on national security policy.
- Analyze what factors shape public opinion towards military operations and how political considerations might affect presidential decision making.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- How has the news media and the ways in which Americans get news of the world changed from the Cold War era? What are the implications for national security policymaking?
- What is “truth decay” and do you agree that it is a significant problem? What, if anything, can U.S. policymakers do to mitigate “fake news”, conspiracy theories, and foreign disinformation?
- What do you think are important factors in determining whether or not the American public supports military action overseas? Can you apply this to some prospective future conflicts?
- How might public opinion and electoral considerations affect a president’s decision to use military force, or to manage the conduct of an ongoing conflict?

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Woodruff, Judy. “Exploring the links between political polarization and declining trust in news media.” *PBS News Hour*, July 31 2024 [video, 11 min].
- Williams, Heather J. and Caitlin McCulloch. “Truth Decay and National Security: Intersections, Insights, and Questions for Future Research.” Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2023.
- Berinsky, Adam. “Public Opinion and International Conflict.” In *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Robert Scott and Stephen Kosslyn eds. Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Friedman, Jeffery. “What is the Commander in Chief Test and Why Does It Matter?”. In *The Commander-in-Chief Test: Public Opinion and the Politics of Image-Making in US Foreign Policy*. Cornell Univ. Press, 2022.
- Smeltz, Dina, et. al. *Chicago Council Survey of American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy 2023*. Chicago Council on Global Affairs, September 2023. (READ 1 – 17 ONLY)



## IS – 13

# Strategic Risk I – Joint Force Employment

### Focus

In the first session of a two-part class on strategic risk and national-level decision making to ensure the United States maintains its advantage in all crises and against all adversaries, we review the Joint Force Employment (JFE) activity from the Global Integration Model. The objective of Global Integration is to “prioritize operations and resources on a global basis to enable senior leaders to pursue operational and strategic-level objectives” (Joint Publication 1, Joint Warfighting). Does the United States have enough resources to deter all adversaries while maintaining consistent competitive advantage to achieve future strategic outcomes? The concept of Global Integration allows students to consider the Department of Defense’s approach to address transregional challenges in multiple domains within the contemporary security environment. One Department of Defense process that exemplifies the challenges presented today is Global Force Management (GFM). Today, Combatant Command requirements exceed force provider capabilities and capacities. Understanding GFM is key to identifying global risk to warfighting readiness and assessments that support building a more responsive and lethal force.

### Outcomes

- Understand Joint Force Employment (JFE) begins with strategy, enables strategic decision making, and is key to strategic deterrence.
- Comprehend the Global Force Management (GFM) processes (Directed Readiness, Assignment, Allocation, Apportionment, and Assessment – DR4A) and the importance to strategic guidance and policies.
- Analyze the risk to force, risk to mission, and risk to strategy associated with JFE.

### Discussion Questions

- How important is Joint Force Employment to Global Integration?
- Who are the key stakeholders in Global Force Management and who has the most influence?
- How would you apply risk analysis to current operations, campaigns, and future potential conflicts, knowing there are Service readiness issues, finite Joint force structure, and modernization timeline implications?
- Should the global U.S. military posture be altered, and if so, how? Do you think your assigned region for TSDM has enough forces? Depending on your answer, what should be done?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Dunford, Joseph F. 2018. “The Character of War and Strategic Landscape Have Changed.” Joint Force Quarterly: JFQ, no. 89.
- The NSA Debrief Episode 5: “Global Integration for an Interconnected Security Environment.” U.S. Naval War College, 2023. YouTube video, 13 min.
- Conway, Tim. Information Paper, Subject: Global Force Management. Office of the J-35. Suffolk, VA, 2023.
- Donnelly, Bill. “I Could Barely Even Spell GFM...” War Room Online Journal, 2 Nov 2023.
- Lee, Caitlin. "The U.S. Military’s Force-Management Tug-of-War," War on the Rocks, 23 Mar 2022.
- Wittman, Robert and Seth Mouton, et al. Congressional Letter to the Honorable Lloyd Austin and The Honorable Kathleen Hicks. Washington, D.C., 5 April 2021.



## IS – 13

# Strategic Risk I – Joint Force Employment

### Doctrinal Foundation (SCAN)

- Joint Chiefs of Staff. Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States. JP 5-0. Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2020. (SCAN Appendix D)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. “Joint Strategic Planning System.” Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3100.01F. 29 January 2024. (SCAN Enclosure E)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint Planning and Execution Overview and Policy Framework. CJCS Guide 3130. Washington, D.C. CJCS, 12 Apr 2023. (SCAN Enclosure A)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint Risk Analysis Methodology. CJCS Manual 3105.01A. Washington, D.C. CJCS, 12 Oct 2021. (SCAN Enclosure A, B, and C)



## FPA – 14

### External Influencers: Think Tanks, Interest Groups, and Lobbyists

#### **Focus**

In addition to creating the framework for institutions of government, the U.S. Constitution's guarantees of individual rights of speech, assembly, and petition have enabled the emergence of an array of non-governmental organizations and individuals who influence foreign and national security policy. This session examines how actors such as think tanks, interest groups, lobbyists, and other external influencers engage with law- and policymakers in attempts, often organized, to influence U.S. legislation and policymaking.

#### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend the organizational characteristics of think tanks, interest groups, lobbyists, and other groups interested in influencing policy and legislative decisions in the defense and national security realms.
- Comprehend the means by which think tanks, interest groups, lobbyists, and other non-state actors can impact U.S. policymaking. Examine ways these institutions may be changing and distinctions between domestic and foreign influence seekers.
- Understand and assess distinctions in types of power and influence and their impact on policy decisions.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- Non-governmental organizations tend to be less hierarchical and more horizontally distributed than government agencies. Why, and what implications are there for how non-governmental organizations function, particularly when engaging government counterparts?
- What is a think tank and what different types of think tanks exist? How do think tanks achieve influence in policymaking? Why do policymakers draw on think tank expertise and how can one judge or measure think tank outputs?
- Why are interest groups formed? What mechanisms do they use to express their policy interests, expertise and recommended policy changes? What makes some interest groups more influential than others?
- How and to what extent can think tanks, interest groups, lobbyists, and individuals influence policy or legislative decision-making processes?

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Cloud, John A. and Nikolas Gvosdev. "Deploying Influence and Expertise: Think Tanks, Interest Groups and Lobbyists in the Theater Security Enterprise." In *Navigating the Theater Security Enterprise*, 97–123. Newport, RI: National Security Affairs Department, U.S. Naval War College, 2018.
- Stern, David L. "As U.S. Rushes to Send Military Aid, Ukrainians Applaud Lobbying Effort". *Washington Post*. April 28, 2024.
- Freeman, Ben. "Defense Contractor Funded Think Tanks Dominate Ukraine Debate". QI Briefs #41. Quincy Institute. June 1, 2023.



## IS – 14

# Strategic Risk II: Joint Force Development and Design

### Focus

IS-13 introduced you to strategic risk and was focused on the near-term planning horizon, but what about maintaining advantage in the future? IS-14 approaches transregional challenges across multiple domains with an assessment of strategic risk and strategic-level decision making in the 2-15 year timeframe. This lesson focuses on two subcomponents of the Joint Strategic Planning System (JSPS) that are specifically involved in force planning and capabilities requirements development: Joint Force Development and Design (JFDD) and the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS), as well as the role of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) in the requirements development process. The JSPS is the primary method by which the CJCS fulfills the responsibilities outlined in Section 153 of Title 10, U.S. Code. Seminars will examine the important role of joint operating concepts in the JFDD and JCIDS processes in preparation for their own concept development during the Final Exercise.

### Outcomes

- Understand JFDD begins with strategy, enables strategic decision making, and is key to future strategic deterrence.
- Comprehend that JFDD processes (includes: JROC/JCIDS) begin with concept development which leads to identifying crucial capabilities required for the future force and consider the strategic risk at stake if the U.S. gets this wrong.
- Understand the mission of the JROC and the general process through which joint requirements and capabilities are identified and developed using the JCIDS.
- Analyze crucial maritime concepts and capabilities required to achieve strategic JFDD ends.

### Discussion Questions

- Has the Joint Warfighting Concept (JWC) remedied the weaknesses identified by Benfield and Grant?
- What role do joint operating concepts play in the JFDD process?
- How do the JFDD and JCIDS processes integrate? What is the role of the JROC?
- What specific challenges have historically made effective Navy force planning difficult? What are some potential solutions to those challenges?

### Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- The NWC Talks: “Logic of Force Planning with Jim Cook.” U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube video, 13 min.
- Benfield, Paul and Greg Grant. “Improving Joint Operational Concept Development within the U.S. Department of Defense.” Center for a New American Security report. October 21, 2021.
- Walsh, Thomas A. and Alexandra L. Huber. “A Symphony of Capabilities: How the Joint Warfighting Concept Guides Service Force Design and Development.” *Joint Force Quarterly* 111, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2023: 4-15.
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Implementing Joint Force Development and Design*. CJCS Instruction 3030.01A. Washington, DC: CJCS, 3 October 2022. (READ A1-A8)



## IS – 14

### Strategic Risk II: Joint Force Development and Design

---

- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Charter of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council and Implementation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System*. CJCS Instruction 5123.01I. Washington, DC: CJCS, 30 October 2021. (READ A1-A7)
- U.S. Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System*. JCIDS Manual. Washington, DC: Joint Staff J-8, 30 October 2021. (READ A1-A4)
- Curzon, Daniel and Eric Perinovic, Tyler Pitrof and Shawn Woodford. “Navy Force Planning and Design 1933-2019.” Naval History and Heritage Command report. 2024. (READ 161-167 and 169)





# Defense Budget, Acquisitions, and Innovation

### Focus

IS-14 examined the fundamental linkages between strategic guidance and long-term force design. This complimentary FPA session examines the friction and challenges that emerge when these force design strategies intersect with the complex reality of the defense budgeting process and the myriad influences on defense planning and policy decisions. Specifically, this session will explore the complex process for producing the defense budget, the tensions within the bureaucracy that impact it, and the urgency required to foster innovation in defense planning. This session will illuminate the numerous challenges associated with the current defense budgeting process, known as the Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) system, current reform initiatives, and how emerging technologies affect the formulation of foreign policy in an era of strategic competition and heightened conflict.

### Outcomes

- Understand the current Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Acquisitions (PPBE) process and potential reform initiatives.
- Examine the challenges the current budgeting and acquisitions processes create for innovation and force design.
- Analyze how emerging technologies driving geo-strategic competition interact with the domestic policymaking process to affect national security policy.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the key actors and factors that drive the defense budget and acquisition process?
- What specific challenges does the current budgeting process pose to force design? What obstacles might hinder reform of the process?
- How might various policy decisions affect the rate of innovation and the U.S.'s competitive edge in future conflict?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- Debrief: “Strategy Meets Budget.” [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u1gx3sGjHSI&list=PLam-yp5uUR1bYd36oJd\\_F4mC5d2\\_yjgfd&index=15](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u1gx3sGjHSI&list=PLam-yp5uUR1bYd36oJd_F4mC5d2_yjgfd&index=15)
- Brose, Christian. “Bureaucracy Does its Thing.” In *The Kill Chain: Defending America in the Future of High Tech Warfare*, 206–224. New York: Hachette Books, 2020
- Congressional Research Service. *DoD Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE): Overview and Selected Issues for Congress*. July 11, 2022. (READ pp. 1-13 ONLY)
- Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform. *Defense Resourcing for the Future: Final Report*. 2024. (READ “Executive Summary” ONLY)
- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller). *Defense Budget Overview. United States Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Request*. March 2024 (Rev. April 4, 2024) (READ 1-1 to 1-9)
- Schneider, Jacquelyn. Does Technology Win Wars? The U.S. Military Needs Low-Cost Innovation—Not Big-Ticket Boondoggles. *Foreign Affairs*. March 3, 2023.



## FPA – 15

### Defense Budget, Acquisitions, and Innovation

---

- O’Hanlon, Michael E and Alejandra Rocha. “Strengthening America’s defense industrial base,” Brookings, 20 June 2024.



# IS – 15

## Theater Strategy

### Focus

This session provides an overview of the Unified Command Plan (UCP), combatant commands (CCMD), and their role in developing theater strategy. Sometimes referred to as the fourth level of strategy, theater strategy encompasses the combatant commander's (CCDR) or sub-unified command's ends, ways, means, and risk to achieve national-level policy and strategy in an assigned area of responsibility. Primarily a military strategy, theater strategy provides the vision for the best use of available resources and best analysis of all the instruments of national power to inform strategic decision making. Two of the most important aspects of theater strategy are force employment, often referred to as what it takes to set the theater, and security cooperation, programs that encourage allies and partner nations to work with the United States. The informal phrase "set the theater," often used by planners, is an all-encompassing term meaning the conditions are set in the strategic and operational environment to deter all adversaries and establish the conditions necessary to execute strategic and theater plans. Setting the theater or globe requires forces, footprints, and agreements. Building upon previous discussions of strategy, this lesson will go deeper into a regional approach to strategy with recent examples from combatant commanders.

### Outcomes

- Understand the origins of the UCP and how this facilitates setting the globe.
- Understand how combatant commands develop theater strategy and apply to a regional framework.
- Analyze how geographic combatant commanders use security cooperation activities to advance and defend U.S. interests.
- Assess how well the current theater strategies of relevant geographic combatant commands are performing and use these observations for the Final Exercise (FX) when students create their own regional strategy.

### Discussion Questions

- Why did the United States create geographic combatant commands? Is the current structure still effective? What are the most effective ways for CCDRs to work together and what is their relationship with the Joint Staff?
- How important is theater strategy? When reading the command posture statement or theater strategy, consider the combatant commander's answers to the following questions: How does the combatant command perceive the security environment given threats, challenges, and opportunities? What policy objectives does the combatant command want to achieve (ends)? How does the combatant command plan to execute its strategy (ways)? What resources are available to achieve the policy objectives (means)? What are the mismatches (risk)?
- Recognizing that military assistance in weak states is not a panacea for broader problems within a country, what can theater commanders and interagency partners do to align security cooperation programs with larger purposes of U.S. support for a country or region?



## IS – 15

# Theater Strategy

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)**

- The NWC Talks: “Combatant Command 101 with Ross Coffey.” U.S. Naval War College, 2021. YouTube video, 14 min.
- Feickert, Andrew. The Unified Command Plan and Combatant Commands: Background and Issues for Congress. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 2013. (SCAN 1-10, READ 52-58)
- Reveron, Derek S, James L Cook, and Ross M Coffey. 2022. “Competing Regionally: Developing Theater Strategy.” *Joint Force Quarterly* 104, 2022.
- Bouchat, Clarence J. “An Introduction to Theater Strategy and Regional Security.” Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, 2007.
- Read only Assigned Region:
  - AOR#1: Cavoli, Christopher G. (General). Commander, United States European Command and NATO’s Supreme Allied Commander Europe. Statement before the 118<sup>th</sup> Congress. House Armed Services Committee, 10 April 2024.
  - AOR#2: U.S. Department of State. “U.S. Security Cooperation with Ukraine Fact Sheet.” 29 July 2024.
  - IOR#1: U.S. Central Command. Theater Strategy: People, Partners, and Innovation. MacDill Air Force Base, FL: Headquarters USCENTCOM, 2023.
  - IOR#2: Rynn, Simon and Benjamin P. Nickels. “Enhancing Security in the Red Sea Arena.” GCM ECSS, The Clock Tower Security Series, 5 March 2024.
  - POR#1: Aquilino, John C. (Admiral). Commander, United States Indo-Pacific Command. Statement before the 118<sup>th</sup> Congress. Senate Armed Services Committee, 21 March 2024.
  - POR#2: Warr, Jonathan B. “Rethinking the Approach to Security Cooperation in the Indo-Pacific.” DKI APCSS, Security Nexus, 29 Sep 2023.



## FPA – 16

### Using Diplomacy

#### **Focus**

Diplomacy is a crucial means of wielding U.S. foreign policy, with a focus on the domestic actors and factors that enable or constrain its use. Two case studies dissect diplomatic efforts that achieved their objectives: managing German reunification and ending the war in the Balkans. We also consider the challenges of multilateral diplomacy along with the ongoing work of sustaining partnerships. We examine how diplomacy and other tools work in tandem to secure outcomes that neither could attain independently.

#### **Outcomes**

- Identify and differentiate the multiple actors involved in using diplomacy as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, including their roles, incentives, and authorities.
- Explore the interagency processes and structures for using diplomacy to advance foreign policy goals.
- Analyze the complexities of multilateral diplomacy in the context of the two-level games framework where domestic elements and public constituencies shape diplomatic initiatives.
- Examine the impact of using diplomacy on the use of other instruments of national power—diplomatic, informational, and economic—in the context of statecraft.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- What were the challenges U.S. diplomats faced in handling German reunification and what elements were critical to the success of negotiations?
- According to Eizenstat, the U.S. diplomatic intervention in the Balkans War was an example of the “marriage of force and diplomacy.” How and when did threat/use of force help attain a diplomatic goal? Can you think of other international conflicts in which U.S. diplomats and military might work together to achieve American foreign policy goals?
- U.S. diplomats frequently find themselves in multilateral fora in which the complexities of negotiations—especially on transborder issues—grow exponentially more complex. Patrick identifies four approaches: charter, club, concert, and coalition. How does each approach reflect and respond to the interests of domestic and foreign audiences?
- Many foreign policy writers speak approvingly of coalitions and partnerships as low-cost alternatives to accomplishing U.S. foreign policy goals. What are the risks of this approach?

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- “The Debrief: “Diplomacy and the State Department.” U.S. Naval War College video, 2023.
- Hutchings, Robert. “American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War in Europe.” In *Foreign Policy Breakthroughs: Cases in Successful Diplomacy*, edited by Robert Hutchings and Jeremi Suri, 148-172. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Eizenstat, Stuart E. “The Balkan Wars: The Marriage of Force and Diplomacy.” In *The Art of Diplomacy: How American Negotiators Reached Historic Agreements that Changed the World*, 187-217. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2024.
- Stewart Patrick. “Four Contending U.S. Approaches to Multilateralism.” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, January 2023.



# International Security Sub-course

## The Regional Approach Syllabus Roadmap

### Course Approach

TSDM is focused at the theater-strategic level where students intensively study one region of the world and analyze how U.S. government foreign policy decisions impact theater security.

**Each TSDM seminar will concentrate on a specific geographic region based on a maritime basin model. The three regions are labeled: Atlantic Ocean region, Indian Ocean region, and Pacific Ocean region.**

Students assigned to a region will follow the lesson plan outlined below. Students will receive lessons in this block in what is referred to as the 1 + 1 + 3 framework. First, you will have lessons on adjacent maritime basins and the last three lessons will be a deep dive into your assigned geographic region.



### **Atlantic Ocean region**

IS-16 Pacific Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-17 Indian Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-18 Atlantic Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-19 Atlantic Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends  
IS-20 Atlantic Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges



### **Indian Ocean region**

IS-16 Atlantic Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-17 Pacific Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-18 Indian Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-19 Indian Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends  
IS-20 Indian Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges



### **Pacific Ocean region**

IS-16 Indian Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-17 Atlantic Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-18 Pacific Ocean Region Foundations  
IS-19 Pacific Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends  
IS-20 Pacific Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges

*\*Pictures of oceans courtesy of New World Encyclopedia (NWE). The New World Encyclopedia is a free online encyclopedia intended for use by teachers and students. <https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/>*



### Focus

The Pacific Ocean Region (POR) encompasses the largest body of water on the globe. It includes over 37 countries with a combined population of nearly 3 billion. It is a conduit for global trade and investment. But it is also a region fraught with military tensions, great power competition, and persistent antagonism over territorial and sovereignty claims. It features a number of intergovernmental organizations that play an increasing role in security matters, which makes this region a key part of the world to watch as China and the United States compete over their contrary visions of the existing and future world order.

### Outcomes

- Understand the importance of the adjacent region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and any risks to the U.S. achieving its critical objectives.
- Analyze the adjacent region's main geopolitical, socio-economic, demographic, and transnational trends and challenges.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the key interdependencies linking the various countries in the POR?
- What are the sources of military competition or insecurity in the POR?
- What is the Biden Administration's key overarching strategy for the Indo-Pacific region?
- What are some key security challenges in Latin America and how do they affect the larger Trans-Pacific Region?
- How do the U.S. and Chinese visions for the world order differ? Are there commonalities between them?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Arnson, Cynthia J. and Jorge Heine. "Reaching Across the Pacific: Latin America and Asia in the New Century," in *Reaching Across the Pacific: Latin America and Asia in the New Century*, ed. Cynthia J. Arnson and Jorge Heine, with Christine Zaino. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2014. (READ 9-30)
- Cha, Victor D. "Powerplay: Origins of the U.S. Alliance System in Asia." *International Security* 34, no. 3 (2009): 158-196.
- U.S. President. *Indo-Pacific Strategy of the United States*. Washington, DC: White House, 2022.
- The NWC Talks: "Understanding China's Maritime Strategy with James Holmes." U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube video, 10 min.
- Leonard, Mark. "China is Ready for a World of Disorder: America Is Not." *Foreign Affairs* (Jul/Aug 2023): 116-120, 122-127.
- "Relations between Japan and South Korea are blossoming." *The Economist*. March 18, 2024.
- "China's presence in Latin America has expanded dramatically." *The Economist*. July 4, 2024.





## Atlantic Ocean Region Foundations

### Focus

The trans-Atlantic relationship in the Atlantic Ocean Region (AOR) is enduring and important for U.S. security because it encompasses most of America's treaty allies and because of the dense web of economic, political and informational ties that stretch across the Atlantic. When Latin America and West Africa are added, the AOR becomes both the critical nexus for securing American geopolitical and geo-economic interests as well as facilitating the projection of American power around the world.

### Outcomes

- Understand the importance of the adjacent region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and any risks to the U.S. achieving its critical objectives.
- Analyze the adjacent region's main geopolitical, socio-economic, demographic, and transnational trends and challenges.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- How does the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) build a security community between North American and Europe? What are NATO's top security priorities?
- In what ways are there important strategic linkages across continents in the AOR? What interest does the United States have in Europe, Latin America and Africa?
- How is America's relationship to the different parts of the AOR changing over time?
- How does the institutional set of relationships that define the Atlantic community bolster the U.S. position in the world?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- FACT SHEET: 32 Countries Launch the Partnership for Atlantic Cooperation, The White House, September 18, 2023.
- NATO. 2022. Strategic Concept.
- Azubalis, Audronius. NATO and the Global South. Preliminary Draft report of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, March 25, 2024.
- Aronsson, Lisa and Brett Swaney. "Three Priorities for NATO Partnerships in a Contested World." New Atlanticist, June 14, 2021.
- Hamilton, Daniel S. and Joseph P. Quinlan. The Transatlantic Economy 2024. Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, 2024. (READ v-x and 1-13)





### Focus

The Indian Ocean Region (IOR) is a nexus of global trade, geopolitics, and security. With over 2.7 billion people residing within its bounds, the IOR connects East Africa, the Greater Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Oceania. Great power competition plays out across IOR, with India and China contesting each other in this region the most as the U.S., Europe, and Russia also vie for access and influence within this context. Middle powers like Iran also compete, creating complications for U.S. national interests. Climate change vulnerability looms large, which impacts economies and global stability. Maritime security lies at the heart of the IOR's future, where geopolitical, environmental, and economic concerns converge. China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) and its growing influence in the region add further complexity, and nuclear rivalries (e.g., China, India, Pakistan) are concerning if competition and conflict is not managed appropriately. As the U.S. navigates its priorities in the IOR, identifying challenges and opportunities to achieve stability, means understanding the role of regional institutions and how to balance cooperation and competition.

### Outcomes

- Understand the importance of the adjacent region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and any risks to the U.S. achieving its critical objectives.
- Analyze the geopolitical, socio-economic, demographic, and transnational trends and challenges.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- How does the IOR factor into great power competition with China and Russia?
- How does China attempt to compete with India and the West in the region?
- Can the United States develop an effective IOR-focused regional strategy? How can the United States work more closely with other powers in the region?
- How do maritime Indian Ocean challenges provide a basis for common action? How can regional institutions and power dynamics be leveraged to increase cooperation and reduce competition?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Darshana M. Baruah, Nitya Labh & Jessica Greely. 2023. "Mapping the Indian Ocean Region." *Carnegie Endowment for Peace*. (READ 1-34)
- Graham, Jeffrey D. 2022. "Building an Enduring U.S.-India Partnership to Secure a Free, Open, and Prosperous Indo-Pacific Region." *Joint Forces Quarterly*, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter: 23-38.
- Trivedi, Atman, Katherine Hadda & Akhil Bery. 2022. "US-India Economic Integration: Towards an Agenda for Growing Manufacturing and Resilient Supply Chains." *Atlantic Council*.
- Grare, Frédéric & Manisha Reuter. 2023. "The battle for the Indian Ocean: How the EU and India can strengthen maritime security." *European Council on Foreign Relations*.
- Tyler, Melissa Conley. 2024. "The future of the Quad in the Indo-Pacific." *Observer Researcher Foundation*.
- The NWC Talks Episode 11: "Nuclear Southern Asia with Frank O'Donnell." U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube, 19 min.



## FPA – 17

### Using Information

#### **Focus**

Information is an important tool of foreign policy but it comes with implementation challenges. We will focus on strategic narrative and rhetoric, the relationship between intelligence and policymaking, intelligence disclosures, and communication in the modern information environment. The session builds on your understanding of the executive branch and the domestic political system and encourages forward-looking application of FPA course concepts.

#### **Outcomes**

- Identify and differentiate the multiple actors involved in using information as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, including their roles, incentives, and authorities.
- Explore the interagency processes and structures for using informational tools to advance foreign policy goals, including the tensions that often arise between intelligence professionals and policymakers.
- Explore how polarization, misinformation, and other features of the current information environment create challenges for crafting a strategic narrative.
- Examine the impact of using information on the use of other instruments of national power—diplomatic, military, and economic—in the context of statecraft.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- What tradeoffs do governments face in framing and justifying their foreign policy choices and grand strategic vision?
- What factors and actors constrain and enable U.S. government to use information in our networked world?
- Observers lament that policymakers often disregard intelligence. Why? Is it sometimes justified?
- What are the potential short-term and long-term consequences of intelligence disclosures?

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Goddard, Stacie. "Rhetoric, Legitimation, and Grand Strategy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Grand Strategy*, ed. Ronald Krebs and Thierry Balzacq, 322-336. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Jervis, Robert. "Why Intelligence and Policymakers Clash." *Political Science Quarterly* 125, no. 2 (2010): 185-204.
- Morell, Michael and David Gioe. "Spy and Tell: The Promise and Peril of Disclosing Intelligence for Strategic Advantage." *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2024.
- Miller, Greg, Ellen Nakashima, and Adam Entous. "Obama's Secret Struggle to Punish Russia for Putin's Election Assault." *The Washington Post*, June 23, 2017.



### Focus

The Indian Ocean Region (IOR) is a nexus of global trade, geopolitics, and security. With over 2.7 billion people residing within its bounds, the IOR connects East Africa, the Greater Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Oceania. Great power competition plays out across IOR, with India and China contesting each other in this region the most as the US, Europe, and Russia also vie for access and influence within this context. Middle powers like Iran also compete, creating complications for US national interests. Climate change vulnerability looms large, which impacts economies and global stability. Maritime security lies at the heart of the IOR's future, where geopolitical, environmental, and economic concerns converge. China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) and its growing influence in the region add further complexity, and nuclear rivalries (e.g., China, India, Pakistan) are concerning if competition and conflict is not managed appropriately. As the U.S. navigates its priorities in the IOR, identifying challenges and opportunities to achieve stability, means understanding the role of regional institutions and how to balance cooperation and competition.

### Outcomes

- Understand the importance of the adjacent region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and any risks to the U.S. achieving its critical objectives.
- Analyze the region's geopolitical, socio-economic, demographic, and transnational trends and challenges.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- How does the Indian Ocean basin factor into great power competition with China and Russia?
- How does China attempt to compete with India and the West in the region?
- Can the United States develop an effective trans-Indian ocean-focused regional strategy? How can the United States work more closely with other powers in the region?
- How do maritime Indian Ocean challenges provide a basis for common action? How can regional institutions and power dynamics be leveraged to increase cooperation and reduce competition?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Darshana M. Baruah, Nitya Labh & Jessica Greely. 2023. "Mapping the Indian Ocean Region." *Carnegie Endowment for Peace*. (READ 1-34)
- Graham, Jeffrey D. 2022. "Building an Enduring U.S.-India Partnership to Secure a Free, Open, and Prosperous Indo-Pacific Region." *Joint Forces Quarterly*, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter: 23-38.
- Trivedi, Atman, Katherine Hadda & Akhil Bery. 2022. "US-India Economic Integration: Towards an Agenda for Growing Manufacturing and Resilient Supply Chains." *Atlantic Council*.
- Grare, Frédéric & Manisha Reuter. 2023. "The battle for the Indian Ocean: How the EU and India can strengthen maritime security." *European Council on Foreign Relations*.
- Tyler, Melissa Conley. 2024. "The future of the Quad in the Indo-Pacific." *Observer Researcher Foundation*.
- The NWC Talks Episode 11: "Nuclear Southern Asia with Frank O'Donnell." U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube, 19 min.



## Pacific Ocean Region Foundations

---

### Focus

The Pacific Ocean Region (POR) encompasses the largest body of water on the globe. It includes over 37 countries with a combined population of nearly 3 billion. It is a conduit for global trade and investment. But it is also a region fraught with military tensions, great power competition, and persistent antagonism over territorial and sovereignty claims. It features a number of intergovernmental organizations that play an increasing role in security matters, which makes this region a key part of the world to watch as China and the United States compete over their contrary visions of the existing and future world order.

### Outcomes

- Understand the importance of the adjacent region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and any risks to the U.S. achieving its critical objectives.
- Analyze the adjacent region's main geopolitical, socio-economic, demographic, and transnational trends and challenges.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the key interdependencies linking the various countries in the POR?
- What are the sources of military competition or insecurity in the POR?
- What is the Biden Administration's key overarching strategy for the Indo-Pacific region?
- What are some key security challenges in Latin America and how do they affect the larger Trans-Pacific Region?
- How do the U.S. and Chinese visions for the world order differ? Are there commonalities between them?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Arnson, Cynthia J. and Jorge Heine. "Reaching Across the Pacific: Latin America and Asia in the New Century," in *Reaching Across the Pacific: Latin America and Asia in the New Century*, ed. Cynthia J. Arnson and Jorge Heine, with Christine Zaino. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2014. (READ 9-30)
- Cha, Victor D. "Powerplay: Origins of the U.S. Alliance System in Asia." *International Security* 34, no. 3 (2009): 158-196.
- U.S. President. *Indo-Pacific Strategy of the United States*. Washington, DC: White House, 2022.
- The NWC Talks: "Understanding China's Maritime Strategy with James Holmes." U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube video, 10 min.
- Leonard, Mark. "China is Ready for a World of Disorder: America Is Not." *Foreign Affairs* (Jul/Aug 2023): 116-120, 122-127.
- "Relations between Japan and South Korea are blossoming." *The Economist*. March 18, 2024.
- "China's presence in Latin America has expanded dramatically." *The Economist*. July 4, 2024.

**Focus**

The trans-Atlantic relationship in the Atlantic Ocean Region (AOR) is enduring and important for U.S. security because it encompasses most of America's treaty allies and because of the dense web of economic, political and informational ties that stretch across the AOR. When Latin America and West Africa are added, the AOR becomes both the critical nexus for securing American geopolitical and geo-economic interests as well as facilitating the projection of American power around the world.

**Outcomes**

- Understand the importance of the adjacent region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and any risks to the U.S. achieving its critical objectives.
- Analyze the adjacent region's main geopolitical, socio-economic, demographic, and transnational trends and challenges.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

**Discussion Questions**

- How does the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) build a security community between North American and Europe? What are NATO's top security priorities?
- In what ways are there important strategic linkages across continents in the AOR? What interest does the United States have in Europe, Latin America and Africa?
- How is America's relationship to the different parts of the AOR changing over time?
- How does the institutional set of relationships that define the Atlantic community bolster the U.S. position in the world?

**Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)**

- FACT SHEET: 32 Countries Launch the Partnership for Atlantic Cooperation, The White House, September 18, 2023.
- NATO. 2022. Strategic Concept.
- Azubalis, Audronius. NATO and the Global South. Preliminary Draft report of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, March 25, 2024.
- Aronsson, Lisa and Brett Swaney. "Three Priorities for NATO Partnerships in a Contested World." New Atlanticist, June 14, 2021.
- Hamilton, Daniel S. and Joseph P. Quinlan. The Transatlantic Economy 2024. Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, 2024. (READ v-x and 1-13)



## FPA – 18

### Using Military Force

#### **Focus**

This session discusses the authorities, powers, and influences that underpin a decision to use military force. The U.S. Congress has not invoked its constitutional power to formally declare war since the Second World War, yet U.S. forces have engaged in hundreds of military operations and combat situations since then, while U.S. leaders have threatened to use military force in many more instances. The readings discuss a wide range of tools that the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. government have available when deciding to use military force (or not), providing case studies of how these decisions have been made in the past.

#### **Outcomes**

- Identify and differentiate the multiple actors involved in using military action as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, including their roles, incentives, and authorities.
- Understand the tools and options available to policymakers when deciding to use military force.
- Explore the interagency processes and structures for using military tools to advance foreign policy goals, including potential civil-military friction.
- Analyze how the U.S. Constitution, foreign policy processes, and other factors and actors affect contemporary decisions to use military force.
- Examine the impact of using the military on the use of other instruments of national power—diplomatic, informational, and economic—in the context of statecraft.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- What powers and authorities are available to the U.S. president in deciding to use military force? What powers and authorities are available to Congress? How have these powers and authorities changed—or been interpreted differently—over time and why?
- Presidents have declared a “red line” as a warning to U.S. adversaries. Are there differences in the factors and actors involved in threatening force vs. using force? How does this affect the credibility of threats?
- How does the use of military force alter a nation's ability to conduct diplomacy, manage information, and influence economic conditions?

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Elsea, Jennifer K. “Defense Primer: Legal Authorities for the Use of Military Force.” *In Focus*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Updated December 14, 2022.
- Waxman, Matthew C. “The Power to Threaten War.” *The Yale Law Journal* 123, no. 6 (2014): 1626-1691. (READ 1635–1653 and 1658–1662 ONLY)
- Altman, Dan. “Advancing Without Attacking: The Strategic Game Around the Use of Force,” *Security Studies* 27, no.1 (2018): 58-88 (READ 58 – 73 and 86 – 88 ONLY)
- Tama, Jordan. “War Powers Authorities.” Chapter 5 in *Bipartisanship and US Foreign Policy*, 93-115. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2023.



### **Focus**

The trans-Atlantic relationship in the Atlantic Ocean Region (AOR) is enduring and important for U.S. security because it encompasses most of America's treaty allies and because of the dense web of economic, political and informational ties that stretch across the Atlantic. When Latin America and West Africa are added, the AOR becomes both the critical nexus for securing American geopolitical and geo-economic interests as well as facilitating the projection of American power around the world.

### **Outcomes**

- Understand the foundations of the assigned region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and subregions.
- Understand the importance and origins of the U.S. treaty system within the region.
- Understand regional political dynamics and the scope and limits of interdependencies.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### **Discussion Questions**

- The trans-Atlantic community initially started as a formulation to describe relations between Europe and North America. Can the concept in the AOR be widened to encompass West Africa and Latin America?
- How does the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) build a security community between North America and Europe? How does NATO prioritize security challenges from Russia, China, the Middle East and Africa?
- How does the institutional set of relationships that define the Atlantic community bolster the U.S. position in the world?

### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)**

- FACT SHEET: 32 Countries Launch the Partnership for Atlantic Cooperation, The White House, September 18, 2023.
- NATO 2022 Strategic Concept.
- The Strategic Compass of the European Union (adopted 31 March 2022).
- López-Aranda, Ricardo. "Seven Building Blocks for a Resilient Transatlantic Relationship," German Marshall Fund, July 14, 2022.
- Lesser, Ian. "Southern Atlanticism Revisited: What Scope for North-South Consensus?" German Marshall Fund, January 26, 2023.
- Azubalis, Audronius. NATO and the Global South. Preliminary Draft report of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, March 25, 2024.





### Focus

The Indian Ocean Region (IOR) is critical to global trade, security, and geopolitics. It ties East Africa, the Greater Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Oceania. Over 2.7 billion people live within the IOR, connecting the resource-rich eastern coast of Africa and the Middle East to Asia's labor markets and manufacturing industries. India is a rising power in the region and there are a number of key middle powers (Australia, Indonesia, Iran and South Africa). Due to growing geopolitical importance and concern about access and influence, China, Russia, and the U.S. (and many Western powers), are increasingly competing across the IOR.

### Outcomes

- Understand the foundations of the assigned region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and subregions.
- Understand the importance and origins of the U.S. treaty system within the region.
- Understand regional political dynamics and the scope and limits of interdependencies.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- How does the IOR factor into great power competition with China and Russia?
- How does China attempt to compete with India and the West in the region? How does China push for both maritime and land routes through the IOR?
- Why has the United States traditionally viewed this area primarily through the lens of its subregions? Why are states like India attempting to conceptualize a regional view of security and partnership?
- How does the IOR act as a keystone connecting the POR and AOR? What are the risks of thinking of the IOR as a subunit of the larger POR?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Darshana M. Baruah, Nitya Labh & Jessica Greely. 2023. "Mapping the Indian Ocean Region." *Carnegie Endowment for Peace*. (READ 1-34)
- Graham, Jeffrey D. 2022. "Building an Enduring U.S.-India Partnership to Secure a Free, Open, and Prosperous Indo-Pacific Region." *Joint Forces Quarterly*, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter: 23-38.
- Baruah, Darshana M. 2023. "Surrounding the Indian Ocean: PRC Influence in the Indian Ocean." *Carnegie Endowment for Peace*, Congressional Testimony.
- Bhatt, Pooja. 2023. "The Indian Ocean Is Witnessing a Surge in Russian Military Exercises." *The Diplomat*.
- Jacob, Happymon. 2024. "The end of South Asia: A Region in Name Only." *Foreign Affairs*.





### Focus

The Pacific Ocean Region (POR) encompasses the largest body of water on the globe. It includes over 37 countries with a combined population of nearly 3 billion. It is a conduit for global trade and investment. But it is also a region fraught with military tensions, great power competition, and persistent antagonism over territorial and sovereignty claims. It features a number of intergovernmental organizations that play an increasing role in security matters, which makes this region a key part of the world to watch as China and the United States compete over their contrary visions of the existing and future world order.

### Outcomes

- Understand the foundations of the assigned region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests and security.
- Identify the challenges of great power competition in the region and subregions.
- Understand the importance and origins of the U.S. treaty system within the region.
- Understand regional political dynamics and the scope and limits of interdependencies.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the key interdependencies linking the various countries in the POR?
- What are the sources of military competition or insecurity in the POR?
- What is the Biden Administration's key overarching strategy for the Indo-Pacific region?
- What are some key security challenges in Latin America and how do they affect the larger POR?
- How do the U.S. and Chinese visions for the world order differ? Are there commonalities between them?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Arnson, Cynthia J. and Jorge Heine. "Reaching Across the Pacific: Latin America and Asia in the New Century," in *Reaching Across the Pacific: Latin America and Asia in the New Century*, ed. Cynthia J. Arnson and Jorge Heine, with Christine Zaino. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2014. (READ 9-30)
- Cha, Victor D. "Powerplay: Origins of the U.S. Alliance System in Asia." *International Security* 34, no. 3 (2009): 158-196.
- U.S. President. *Indo-Pacific Strategy of the United States*. Washington, DC: White House, 2022.
- The NWC Talks: "Understanding China's Maritime Strategy with James Holmes." U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube video, 10 min.
- Leonard, Mark. "China is Ready for a World of Disorder: America Is Not." *Foreign Affairs* (Jul/Aug 2023): 116-120, 122-127.
- "Relations between Japan and South Korea are blossoming." *The Economist*. March 18, 2024.
- "China's presence in Latin America has expanded dramatically." *The Economist*. July 4, 2024.



## FPA – 19

# Using Economic Statecraft

### Focus

Economic policy is a critical component of foreign policy, as discussed previously in International Security. Using the tools of economic statecraft is a complex effort involving executive and legislative branches of government, a variety of domestic, regional, and global inter-governmental monetary and financial institutions, and the private sector. This session examines the agents of U.S. foreign policy economic power and the range of foreign policy tools available, including coercive tools such as quotas, tariffs, sanctions, and export controls, along with positive incentives such as trade, security assistance, and economic development.

### Outcomes

- Identify and differentiate the multiple actors involved in using diplomacy as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, including their roles, incentives, and authorities.
- Understand the primary tools of economic statecraft and their use in coercive and friendly scenarios.
- Explore the interagency processes and structures for using economic tools to advance foreign policy goals.
- Consider the challenges and trade-offs the United States faces when confronted with the need to protect national security while also maintaining economic and technological advantages.
- Examine the impact of using economic tools on the use of other instruments of national power—diplomatic, informational, and military—in the context of statecraft.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the purposes of economic statecraft, which actors and processes are involved, and what are the obstacles and limitations?
- What tradeoffs do policymakers consider when using economic tools to advance national security goals?
- When thinking about how to achieve strategic goals via the application of power, what do you need to think about in order to determine which tools of statecraft to use and how to combine them?
- How does the two-level games framework help us understand recent use of economic tools, such as sanctions against Russia?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts).

- Bledsoe, Scott, and Jeremy D. Mayer. "The National Economic Council." Report 2021-35, The White House Transition Project (2021): 1-11.
- Rosenberg, Elizabeth, Peter Harrell, Paula J. Dobriansky and Adam Szubin. "America's Use of Coercive Economic Statecraft: A Report from Select Members of CNAS Task Force on the Future of U.S. Coercive Economic Statecraft." Center for a New American Security (December 2020): .
- Chivvis, Christopher and Kapstein, Ethan B. "U.S. Strategy and Economic Statecraft: Understanding the Tradeoffs." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, (April 28, 2022): 3-12.
- Tama, Jordan. "Sanctions on Russia." Chapter 6 in *Bipartisanship and US Foreign Policy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2023.



## Atlantic Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends

### Focus

The Atlantic Ocean Region (AOR) involves some of the closest political, economic, and cultural relationships for the United States, but also a huge diversity of dynamics and interests. This session will help students understand main trends shaping social and economic factors in the region.

### Outcomes

- Understand the socio-economic factors driving strategic trends in the assigned region and across subregions.
- Identify main demographic, economic, transnational, maritime, and environmental trends shaping domestic and international interests in the region.
- Assess mechanisms for strategic stability in this region.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- Should the U.S. pursue economic re-globalization, de-globalization, or something in-between? What economic challenges and opportunities are present in the AOR?
- How does demography impact security and economics? How do economics and security impact demography? What are the long-term trends of significance?
- Can international institutions help the U.S. pursue its economic and security interests in a context of changing economic patterns, climate change, and technological advancement?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Hamilton, Daniel, and Joseph Quinlan. 2023. "Executive Summary" and "Decoupling, Derisking and Diversifying." In *The Transatlantic Economy 2023*. Washington, DC: Foreign Policy Institute, Johns Hopkins SAIS. (READ v-x and 30-41)
- Balzer, Harley. "A Russia Without Russians?." The Atlantic Council, *Russia Tomorrow*. August 7, 2024. (READ 2-15)
- Goldstone, J. A., and J. F. May. "The global economy's future depends on Africa: as others slow, a youthful continent can drive growth." *Foreign Affairs*, May 18, 2023.
- O'Neil, Shannon K. "The United States' Missed Opportunity in Latin America." *Foreign Affairs*, February 20, 2024.
- Purdy, Caitlin, and Rodrigo Castillo. 2022. "The Future of Mining in Latin America: Critical Minerals." Washington, DC: Brookings Institute. (READ 4-23)



## Indian Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends

### Focus

This session will consider socio-economic trends in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR) and how they shape international interests and theater strategy. Economic power, demographics, and social trends play a crucial role in state bargaining power and alliance formation. What kinds of multilateral institutions have emerged in the region to address shared socio-economic and strategic concerns? What roles do domestic politics and the political economy of actors in the region play in advancing U.S. interests – and, importantly, what should be done about it?

### Outcomes

- Understand the socio-economic factors driving strategic trends in the assigned region and across subregions.
- Identify main demographic, economic, transnational, maritime, and environmental trends shaping domestic and international interests in the region.
- Assess mechanisms for strategic stability in this region.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- How do domestic trends – demographic, economic, political etc. – contribute to strategic stability in the IOR?
- Does the interconnected nature of economic and environmental interests in the region elicit cooperation and collaboration, or competition amongst actors?
- What are key challenges to economic participation and empowerment throughout the region? How does gender shape domestic and regional outcomes?
- What tools of U.S. power can be used to set the conditions for the strategic situation in this region to conform to U.S. interests and goals?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Trivedi, Atman, Katherine Hadda & Akhil Bery. 2022. "US-India Economic Integration: Towards an Agenda for Growing Manufacturing and Resilient Supply Chains." *Atlantic Council*.
- Goldstone, Jack A. and John F. May. "The Global Economy's Future Depends on Africa." *Foreign Affairs*, 18 May 2023.
- Aswani, RS. 2020. "Non-Traditional maritime security threats in the Indian Ocean Region: Policy alternatives." *Journal of Public Affairs*, 22(2).
- Alsmadi, Fatima. 2024. "Opportunities and Challenges along the Path of Saudi-Iran Relations." Middle East Council on Global Affairs.
- The White House. "Statement on Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Prosperity." May 23, 2022.
- Women's Economic Empowerment in the Indian Ocean Rim: Progress and Challenges. UN Women, 2020.



## Pacific Ocean Region Socio-Economic Trends

### Focus

This session will consider socioeconomic developments and trends in the Pacific Ocean Region (POR). From the role of particular regions within the POR to issues ranging from demography to natural resources, this session will examine how issues that might not be part of a narrowly construed definition of *national security* nonetheless may shape POR countries' national-security outlooks, capabilities, and policies.

### Outcomes

- Understand the socio-economic factors driving strategic trends in the assigned region and across subregions.
- Identify main demographic, economic, transnational, maritime, and environmental trends shaping domestic and international interests in the region.
- Assess mechanisms for strategic stability in this region.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the chief economic links between Asia and Oceania on the one hand, and Central and South America on the other?
- What role do the Pacific Island Countries (PICs) play in regional politics, especially in terms of how strategic competition manifests? How should the United States approach its relationships with the various PICs?
- What are the demographic challenges facing China (as well as other countries in East Asia)? What impact will these have on economics and security?
- What role does China play with regard to Southeast Asia (and South Asia) when it comes to a vital resource like water? How should Southeast Asian states manage this challenge? Should the United States play any role and, if so, what and how?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Cortes-Sanchez, Sebastian. "Latin America: A Key Stakeholder in Asia-Pacific Trade?" Hinrich Foundation. January 27, 2022.
- Roy, Diana. "China's Growing Influence in Latin America." *Council on Foreign Relations*. Last updated June 15, 2023.
- Yu Lei and Sophia Sui. "China-Pacific Island Countries Strategic Partnership: China's Strategy to Reshape the Regional Order." *East Asia* 39, no. 1 (March 2022): 81-96.
- Minzner, Carl. "China's Doomed Fight against Demographic Decline: Beijing's Efforts to Boost Fertility are Making the Problem Worse." *Foreign Affairs*, May 3, 2022.
- Singh Manhas, Neeraj, and Dr. Rahul M. Lad. "China's Weaponization of Water in Tibet: A Lesson for the Lower Riparian States." *Journal of Indo-Pacific Affairs* 7, no. 2 (March-April 2024): 211-26.



## FPA – 20

### Case Study Analysis: Taiwan Scenario

#### **Focus**

This session exercises students' policy analysis skills as applied to a future-oriented national security decision-making challenge in a critical region. The objective of this session is to determine analytically what actors, factors, dynamics, powers, and influences in the policymaking ecosystem are likely to affect a future policy decision, providing insights into how U.S. policy might be decided in such a circumstance. Having a detailed understanding of the U.S. foreign policymaking apparatus and dynamics will provide students with strategic foresight essential to the military and national security professional.

#### **Outcomes**

- Comprehend and analyze the range of policy actors, factors, dynamics, and influences that could affect U.S. policy regarding a critical national and theater security concern.
- Apply FPA concepts and tools to explore possible policy choices in a hypothetical future-oriented policymaking situation.

#### **Discussion Questions**

- The fictional (but realistic) scenario involves a surprise invasion by the People's Republic of China (PRC) of Taiwan-administered islands (Quemoy and Matsu) that lie just offshore from the PRC mainland. Faculty will provide additional details on this scenario prior to or during class (no additional research is needed). Your task will be to strategically analyze what, if any, policy the U.S. government would be likely to decide in response.
- The required readings provide insights into how U.S., PRC, and Taiwanese officials reacted to past crises across Taiwan Strait and beyond. How did myriad domestic and international dynamics and pressures affect policymakers then and do these still apply today? How has Beijing perceived and responded to past crises involving the United States? What has changed in Taiwan and in cross-strait relations that could impact US policy decision-making? How might leadership changes in US policymaking roles affect this decision?
- Students will also find earlier session readings relevant, both from FPA and IS, as well as from Strategy & Policy or Strategy & War courses. Recall also the Future Warfare Symposium's panel on deterrence and the presentation, in particular, on China's nuclear weapons advances and capabilities.

#### **Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)**

- Mann, Jim. "Crisis Over Taiwan," In *About Face: A History of America's Curious Relationship with China from Nixon to Clinton*, 315–348. First edition, New York: Alfred Knopf, 1999.
- Wu, Xinbo. "Managing Crisis and Sustaining Peace Between China and the United States." Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace (2008.) (READ 7–10; 23–37 ONLY).
- Glaser, Bonnie S. and Bonnie Lin. "The Looming Crisis in the Taiwan Strait." *Foreign Affairs*, July 2, 2024.



IS-20



## Atlantic Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges

### Focus

In ensuring the security of the Atlantic Ocean Region (AOR), the NATO Strategic Concept identifies three core tasks: deterrence, crisis prevention and cooperative security. This session will look at some of the challenges facing the Atlantic community, from geopolitical competition with Russia and China and to energy and supply chain security and the disruptions caused by climate shifts.

### Outcomes

- Understand the security dynamics and future challenges in the assigned region.
- Consider the effectiveness of U.S. strategy in response to security challenges in the region.
- Assess the impact of escalating strategic competition and many other factors leading to possible regional instability.
- Identify the future trends that could preclude the U.S. reaching its desired goals for the region and ways to mitigate the strategic risk.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- How has the Russian invasion of Ukraine changed the security situation for the Atlantic community?
- Can an alliance set up to cope with a conventional military threat from a great power also contribute to non-traditional security challenges facing its members? How do natural threats and transnational challenges erode the security of the entire Atlantic community?
- How do the Russian and Chinese challenges manifest itself in the AOR? What are Russian and Chinese strategic objectives?
- What are the interests and priorities of leaders of Latin American and African countries? How are they different from those of the USA or Europe? Why might these countries become more strategically important in the future?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Berzina, Kristine, Martin Quencez, Michal Baranowski and Adam Hsakou, “Four Challenges for NATO After the Washington Summit,” German Marshall Fund, June 24, 2024.
- Polyakova, Alina, Edward Lucas, Mathieu Boulègue, Catherine Sendak, Scott Kindsvater, Ivanna Kuz, and Sasha Stone, A New Vision for the Transatlantic Alliance: The Future of European Security, the United States, and the World Order after Russia’s War in Ukraine. Washington, DC: CEPA, 30 November 2023.
- Cohen, Raphael S., Elina Treyger, Irina A. Chindea, Christian Curriden, Kristen Gunness, Khrystyna Holynska, Marta Kepe, Kurt Klein, Ashley L. Rhoades, and Nathan Vest, Great-Power Competition and Conflict in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Outside the Indo-Pacific and Europe. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 25 April 2023. (READ v-vii, 25-58, and 59-136)
- Simón, Luis, Giovanni Grevi, Said Moufti, Haizam Amirah- Fernández, Irene Martínez, Jassar Al-Tahat, Nicolás de Pedro and Zaid Eyadat, NATO and the South: A Tale of Three Futures. Madrid: Real Instituto Elcano, 2021. (READ 9-28 and SCAN the rest of the report)





## Indian Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges

---

### Focus

Of the three main oceanic regions, the Indian Ocean Region (IOR) has the least institutional consolidation and recent trends in the area are leading to more competition and conflict. Institutions such as the “Quad” (Quadrilateral Security Dialogue) represent diplomatic opportunities for growing collaboration and cooperation on issues within the IOR. The IOR contains several nuclear and geopolitical rivalries; trading patterns in the area are vital to the stability of the global economy; and challenges emanating from this region pose problems for the security and stability of other parts of the world. Moreover, technological advances are disrupting the power structure across the region, leading to new dynamics that empower state and non-state actors to challenge the status quo.

### Outcomes

- Understand the security dynamics and future challenges in the assigned region.
- Consider the effectiveness of U.S. strategy in response to security challenges in the region.
- Assess the impact of escalating strategic competition and many other factors leading to possible regional instability.
- Identify the future trends that could preclude the U.S. reaching its desired goals for the region and ways to mitigate the strategic risk.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- How will the future of the IOR be impacted by the China-India geopolitical competition? What role or use is there for the Quad within this context?
- How does Iran use its IOR connections and proxies to undermine U.S. interests? How do Saudi-Iran relations create larger security issues for the region?
- How might emerging transnational, environmental, technological, and maritime threats pose challenges as well as opportunities for cooperation and integration across the region?
- Can the United States develop an effective IOR-focused regional strategy? How can the United States work more closely with other Western powers in the IOR?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Dutta, Suyesha & Suvolaxmi Dutta Choudhury. 2024. “Balancing Tides: India’s Competition with China for Dominance of the Indian Ocean Region.” *Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada*.
- Gurjar, Sankalp. 2023. “The Iran Challenge: Unraveling India’s Foreign Policy Dilemma.” *Journal of Indo-Pacific Affairs*.
- Grare, Frédéric & Manisha Reuter. 2023. “The battle for the Indian Ocean: How the EU and India can strengthen maritime security.” *European Council on Foreign Relations*.
- Tyler, Melissa Conley. 2024. “The future of the Quad in the Indo-Pacific.” *Observer Researcher Foundation*.
- Sakunia, Samridhi. 2024. “AI and Deepfakes Played a Big Role in India’s Elections.” *New Lines Magazine*.
- The NWC Talks Episode 11: “Nuclear Southern Asia with Frank O’Donnell.” U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube, 19 min.





## Pacific Ocean Region Security Dynamics and Future Challenges

### Focus

The Pacific Ocean region (POR) confronts a variety of current and emerging security challenges affecting states and human populations. These range from nuclear competition, climate change, to natural disasters and transnational crime, among others. Tensions in the Taiwan Strait underpin the most pressing flashpoint and potential for major power conflict, particularly between the People's Republic of China and the United States. Expanding nuclear capabilities, particularly in China and North Korea, may upend traditional models of regional deterrence and could spark proliferation cascades. Climate change threatens human populations and the viability of states within Oceania and elsewhere in the POR. Transnational crime of various types is a persistent threat inside the POR. Managing and mitigating these security challenges, now and in the future, will be key to the continued stability and prosperity of this region.

### Outcomes

- Understand the security dynamics and future challenges in the assigned region.
- Consider the effectiveness of U.S. strategy in response to security challenges in the region.
- Assess the impact of escalating strategic competition and many other factors leading to possible regional instability.
- Identify the future trends that could preclude the U.S. reaching its desired goals for the region and ways to mitigate the strategic risk.
- Utilize a strategic estimate tool to enable analysis for the Final Exercise at the end of the course.

### Discussion Questions

- What are the chief security linkages between Asia and Oceania on the one hand, and Central and South America on the other?
- Why is the status of Taiwan so sensitive? How does (and will) the Taiwan issue drive U.S.-China competition?
- What factors may sustain or degrade extended deterrence in the context of U.S.-ROK relations?
- How will climate change affect human populations and the viability of states in Oceania and elsewhere?
- How is Australia's military policy transformation affecting the POR's deterrence architecture?
- How are transnational crime entities spreading throughout the POR?

### Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Glaser, Bonnie S., and Bonny Lin. "The Looming Crisis in the Taiwan Strait." *Foreign Affairs*, July 2, 2024.
- Cha, Victor D. "Eyes Wide Open: Strategic Elite Views of South Korea's Nuclear Options." *The Washington Quarterly*, 47:2 (July 2024): 23-40.
- Bowen, Kathryn J., Kristie L. Ebi, Alistair Woodward, Lachlan McIver, Collin Tukuitonga & Patrica Nayna Schwerdtle. "Human Health and Climate Change in the Pacific: a Review of Current Knowledge." *Climate and Development* 16, no. 2 (2024): 119-133.
- Dean, Peter J., Stephen Furehling & Andrew O'Neil. "Australia and the US nuclear umbrella: from deterrence taker to deterrence maker." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 78, no. 1 (2024): 22-39.
- Sampo, Carolina and Valeska Troncoso, "Why Drug Cartels are Expanding to Asia." *Americas Quarterly*, February 14, 2024.



## TSDM – FX-01

### Introduction, Seminar Organization, Product Development

#### Focus

The Final Exercise (FX) is the two-phase TSDM capstone event in which students actively apply concepts from the International Security and Foreign Policy Analysis sub-courses. Each seminar will play the role of a National Security Council Regional Working Group staffed by representatives from across the whole of the U.S. government.

#### Outcomes

- Understand and apply TSDM course concepts.
- Phase One: Identify U.S. vital national interests, conduct a strategic estimate of the assigned ocean region, develop a theater strategic outline for an assigned Combatant Command within your assigned ocean region (INDOPACOM, EUCOM, or CENTCOM), and identify four capabilities required to accomplish or advance the strategic ends.
- Phase Two: Critically analyze the suitability, effectiveness, and applicability of the seminar's theater strategy outline following a regional reframing moment. The seminar will also consider three possible policy response options (these will be provided) and determine which option is most likely to be selected and provide support and rationale for their choice.

#### Session Guidance

- In Phase One, each working group (seminar) must produce and present an executive-level presentation concerning their ocean region for the NSC Regional Director (grading panel). This presentation must clearly identify U.S. interests in the region, provide a strategic estimate of the future security environment throughout the region over the next eight years, present a sub-headings level outline of a theater strategy for either INDOPACOM, EUCOM, or CENTCOM (depending on the seminar's assigned ocean region) that includes desired ends and ways, and a list of 4 capabilities (means) that will be necessary to accomplish or advance the strategic ends. This presentation must be finalized and reviewed with the seminar's consultant team by the end of FX-06. Slide presentations must be submitted to the FX Director NLT 1600 that day and no changes to the slides may be made after this due date.
- In Phase Two, (FX-07), the working groups will be presented with a "reframing moment" that will describe a significant event within their trans-oceanic region. The working group must critically assess the effectiveness and suitability of their strategic proposal considering the reframing moment. Utility, strengths and weaknesses, potential blind spots, and missing concepts or capabilities must all be considered in this critical analysis. It is said that no plan survives first contact with the enemy. Phase Two of the FX provides the seminar with the opportunity to assess how their plan survived and propose potential alterations or additions as desired. Additionally, the seminar will be provided three possible U.S. policy responses to the events of the reframing moment. The seminar is tasked with determining which policy response they believe is most likely to be selected, given various international, organizational, and individual factors influencing policy selection.
- The required working group product is a 30-minute brief covering the required elements of Phase One, followed by a no more than 15-minute brief of the results of the critical assessment of their strategic proposal following the reframing moment and their selected policy response. The grading panel will then engage in 30 minutes of Q&A. Each seminar shall designate at least three briefers, but all students are



## TSDM – FX-01

### Introduction, Seminar Organization, Product Development

expected to participate in the Q&A. Slide templates will be provided to the seminars to help keep the focus on content.

- 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 end of FX-06.
- Time and location of the final presentation and grading panel members will be provided by the FX Director during product development. Grading panels will consist of one member of the seminar's teaching team and two other NSA department faculty members. Grading panels may have guest members from various combatant commands or the joint staff. These guests may participate in the question-and-answer period but will not participate in the grading of presentations.
- The grading panel will evaluate the seminar's ability to clearly communicate their strategic proposal in oral and visual forms in accordance with the Final Exercise evaluation rubric provided in the FX-06 syllabus page and the Grading Criteria provided in the FX-08 syllabus page. Because the TSDM Final Exercise is designed as a team effort exercise, each seminar receives one grade that applies to all seminar members.

#### **Required Preparation**

- Reveron, Derek S, James L Cook, and Ross M Coffey. 2022. "Competing Regionally: Developing Theater Strategy." *Joint Force Quarterly* 104, 2022.



# TSDM – FX-02 through FX-05

## Seminar Product Development

### Focus

Throughout the course, students have learned concepts, skills, and substantive information about their assigned ocean region and the world that will help the seminar produce a list of clearly defined regional U.S. interests, conduct a strategic assessment of their region in a global context over the next eight years, develop an outline of a combatant command's theater strategy to manage threats, risks and pursue U.S. vital national interests, and identify needed capabilities to advance their strategy. Phase One of the final exercise is designed to allow the seminar to work collaboratively to develop these products.

### Outcomes

- Develop a 30-minute oral presentation with visuals that outlines U.S. vital national interests in an assigned oceanic region, provides the seminar's strategic estimate of that region, a theater strategy outline (INDOPACOM, EUCOM, or CENTCOM depending on assigned ocean region), and a list of 4 capabilities required to advance the strategy. The target audience is the National Security Council Regional Director.

### Session Guidance

Required elements of Phase One presentation:

- **Clearly defined list of regional U.S. interests:**
  - The seminar should analyze existing national strategic priorities and present a list of U.S. vital national security interests in their assigned ocean region.
  - Once identified, the hierarchy of interests should form the foundation of a Golden Thread for the seminar's strategic proposal. What does the United States hope to accomplish? Why does the country need to accomplish these goals? All U.S. strategy must serve and be traceable to national interests, and the level of investment is directly tied to the level of importance of those interests.
- **Regional strategic estimate:** Produce a description of your region's significance to U.S. security and interests in a global context, relative to threats, risks, and opportunities.
  - Using existing strategic guidance on national priorities and preferences, evaluate the major trends in the seminar's region (including global context) over the near (0 to 2 year) and medium (3-8 year) term that may challenge the ability to advance and defend U.S. interests. Consider what is happening in terms of demographics, economics, politics, the environment, etc., both within the region and in that region's relationships with the rest of the world. A strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threat (SWOT) analysis may be useful.
  - Consider the U.S. military position in the region and relationships between the geographic combatant commands and with other U.S. government agencies working in the region. Where might the interests and preferences of the CCMD align with those of other actors, and where there might be tension?
  - Consider both the likelihood and the severity of various potentially negative events/trends in the region.
- **Theater strategic outline:** Create a sub-heading level outline of your strategic approach for one combatant command's assigned theater (INDOPACOM, EUCOM, or CENTCOM).



## TSDM – FX-02 through FX-05

### Seminar Product Development

- Having determined the trends the United States would need to influence to achieve its goals, the seminar must develop the outline of a strategic approach to the theater within a global context.
- What is the seminar's vision or desired strategic end-states for the theater in both the near and medium time period? Consider threats and opportunities in terms of likelihood and severity as well as urgency and order of occurrence.
- Describe and discuss concepts (Ways) required to achieve your seminar's strategic objectives. This is the sub-heading level discussion that goes beyond a catchy bumper sticker and gets into the concepts your seminar proposes to achieve the strategic goals. These concepts can be outside the scope of the DoD. If whole of government concepts are presented, the seminar should be prepared to discuss possible policy implications, actors, and processes used in the concept, as well as how geographic CCMD staffs might effectively coordinate interagency organizations and possibly contribute within these concepts.
- Are there other actors the seminar thinks the United States will need to influence to arrive at their desired 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 and without violating important principles?
- Explain the challenges and risks in the proposed strategy and discuss risk mitigation initiatives.
- Consider alignment with national strategic direction from the NSS and NMS.
- **Prioritized list of four required capabilities.**
  - List four prioritized capabilities (Means) the seminar believes are required to carry out its regional strategic proposal (please refer to Capstone Lecture-1). Determine and defend the relative priority of your listed capabilities.
  - In the case of military or defense-centric capabilities, it may be useful to conceptualize these capabilities across the DOTMLPF-P. They can be hardware, or doctrine, organization, skills, etc. Be sure to be prepared to discuss how the how the capability would be used in the field, and how it would help to achieve the desired strategic outcomes. Additionally, seminars should have a sound understanding of how their requirement would work through the capabilities development process and which Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) lane it would fall into.
  - The seminar may list capabilities outside the scope of the DoD. If whole of government capabilities are presented, the seminar should be prepared to discuss possible policy implications, actors, and processes used to attain the required capability, as well as how a CCMD staff might effectively coordinate across the whole of government to integrate these particular capabilities.

#### **Required Preparation**

- Entirety of Foreign Policy Analysis and International Security curricula.



## TSDM – FX-06

### Seminar Phase One Presentation Review

#### **Focus**

No later than the end of this session, the seminar must have presented their Phase One presentation to their faculty consultant team for review and feedback. Additionally, the seminar must electronically submit their Phase One presentation slides to the FX Director no later than 1600 the day FX-06 is scheduled.

#### **Outcomes**

- Conduct a rehearsal of the seminar's Phase One presentation and receive feedback from the faculty consultant team.
- Complete and submit the final version of Phase One slides to FX Director via email no later than 1600.
- Complete "FX Main Themes" questionnaire.

#### **Session Guidance**

- This session concludes the preparation phase of TSDM FX Phase One. The seminar should be prepared to present their strategic proposal briefing to their faculty consultant team in a format that closely resembles the final product that will be graded. Utilizing the presentation checklist included on the second page of this syllabus sheet, the consultant team will provide feedback on the seminar's presentation. Edits in response to this feedback may be incorporated by the seminar into their final presentation version.
- Seminars are encouraged to conduct their Phase One rehearsal with their consultant team **PRIOR** to FX-06 to allow time for incorporation of feedback points. However, the seminar **MUST** conduct a rehearsal with their consultant team no later than FX-06.
- By the end of this session, the seminar will complete their TSDM FX Phase One product development by making any desired changes to the presentation. After these final changes are made, and no later than 1600, the seminar must electronically submit their Phase One presentation slides to the FX Director and Deputy Director. Seminars are not allowed to make changes to their presentation slides after submitting their briefs to the FX Director. **The submitted slides must be the slides used during their graded evaluation.**

Electronically submit seminar Phase One presentations to:

FX Director: CDR Sean Mahoney, [sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu](mailto:sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu)

FX Deputy Director: COL Justin Pritchard, [justin.pritchard@usnwc.edu](mailto:justin.pritchard@usnwc.edu)

#### **Required Preparation**

- Entirety of Foreign Policy Analysis and International Security curricula.



## TSDM – FX-06

### Seminar Phase One Presentation Review

#### **PHASE ONE PRESENTATION REHEARSAL CHECKLIST**

CONTENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets FX requirements</li> <li>• Demonstrates clear understanding of TSDM course concepts</li> <li>• U.S. interests, strategic estimate, strategic outline, and four required capabilities aligned, consistent and mutually supporting</li> <li>• Innovative while aligning with existing U.S. strategic guidance</li> <li>• Seminar makes a strong case for feasibility</li> </ul>	
STRUCTURE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Material logically presented with an easily recognizable “Golden Thread” which ties the whole strategic proposal together from start to finish</li> <li>• Distinctly describes the four required elements</li> <li>• Key concepts evident</li> <li>• Strong concluding position</li> </ul>	
SUPPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Credibility of material</li> <li>• Assumptions validated</li> <li>• Relevance to theme</li> <li>• Verbal / Visual Presentation synergy</li> </ul>	
STYLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persuasively presented</li> <li>• Professional, engaging</li> <li>• Pace, tempo, clarity of delivery</li> <li>• Audience engagement</li> <li>• Though a slide template is provided, seminar must still ensure slides are not overcrowded and graphs, tables or images are appropriately sized for audience legibility</li> </ul>	
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed within allotted time limit (30 min)</li> <li>• Responds well to questions</li> <li>• Managed discussion</li> <li>• Seminar participated in Q&amp;A</li> </ul>	





## TSDM – FX-07

### FX Phase Two: The Reframing Moment

#### **Focus**

In this session, seminars will be provided a “reframing moment” scenario that will describe a significant event within their assigned ocean region. The seminar must conduct a critical analysis of their Phase One strategic proposal and consider three distinct and plausible policy recommendations that address the events of the reframing moment. The seminar must determine which one of these recommendations is most likely to be chosen, given various international, organizational, and individual factors that influence policy selection.

#### **Outcomes**

- Critically analyze and assess Phase One strategic proposal in light of a major regional national security event.
- Analyze three possible policy response options (provided) and determine which option is most likely to be selected, given various international, organizational, and individual factors.

#### **Session Guidance**

- This session provides the seminar an opportunity to put their strategic proposal to the test during a fictional national security event within their assigned ocean region.
- To demonstrate the practical feasibility and utility of the proposed strategy, seminars will be presented with a regional “reframing moment” that describes a specific set of events within the seminar’s ocean region.
- The objective of FX Phase Two is to test the seminar’s ability to apply and critically assess their own strategic proposal. Throughout the semester, seminars have been asked to critically analyze grand strategy and foreign policy case studies; now the seminar must turn that critical light upon their own ideas. The seminar will critically analyze and assess how their strategic proposal meets the challenge described in the reframing moment and determine potential areas of weakness or blind spots, as well as areas where their proposed theater strategy is well suited to meet the challenge. Seminars are encouraged to be very thorough in their critical analysis and seek to determine areas where they could strengthen the effectiveness of their strategy considering the events of the reframing moment. Likewise, if the seminar determines that their strategic proposal effectively mitigates the effects of the reframing moment, those findings should be highlighted as well.
- In addition to critical analysis, the reframing moment requires the seminar to conduct policy analysis against a specific set of circumstances. In addition to a description of the events of the reframing moment, the seminar will be provided with three distinct and plausible U.S. policy response options. The seminar is tasked with analyzing these three options and determining which policy response they believe is most likely to be selected, given various international, organizational, and individual factors that influence policy making and selection.
- The seminar must prepare a short set of slides (3-5) to present the results of their critical analysis and present the policy response option they believe is most likely to be pursued, along with justification. These slides will be presented after the 30-minute phase one presentation, and prior to the question-and-answer period. The seminar is allotted 15 minutes to present its Phase Two presentation. As with the Phase One



## TSDM – FX-07

### FX Phase Two: The Reframing Moment

---

presentation, phase two slides must be submitted to the FX Director and Deputy no later than 1600 the day FX-07 is scheduled on the calendar.

Electronically submit seminar Phase Two presentations to:

FX Director: CDR Sean Mahoney, [sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu](mailto:sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu)

FX Deputy Director: COL Justin Pritchard, [justin.pritchard@usnwc.edu](mailto:justin.pritchard@usnwc.edu)

#### **Required Preparation**

- Entirety of Foreign Policy Analysis and International Security curricula.



# TSDM – FX-08

## Seminar Presentation Grading

### Focus

Seminars will present their presentations (Phase One and Two, consecutively) to a grading panel composed of one member of their own teaching team and two other NSA faculty members. Each grader will award an individual score and the three values will be averaged for a final seminar grade. In addition to the three faculty members, panels may have guest members from various combatant commands or the joint staff. These guest panelists will participate in the question-and-answer period but will not have input to the seminar’s final grade.

### Outcomes

- Effectively deliver a 30-minute presentation of the seminar’s Phase One strategic proposal which must include: U.S. interests in the region, regional strategic estimate, theater strategic outline, and four capabilities required to advance their strategy.
- Effectively deliver a no more than 15-minute brief of the seminar’s Phase Two critical analysis and identify and explain which policy response option they believe is most likely to be selected in light of the events of the reframing moment.
- Effectively respond to questions asked by the faculty panel over the course of 30 minutes.

### Presentation Grading Rubric

Performance Area	Work of very high quality; clearly above the average graduate level.	Expected performance of the average graduate student.	Below the average performance expected for graduate work.	Well below the average performance expected for graduate work. This is unsatisfactory work.
<b>Phase One: Strategic Proposal (30 Minutes Allowed)</b>				
<b>National Interests</b>	<p>Presentation clearly identifies U.S. national interests within their ocean region.</p> <p>National interests are prioritized, and entire strategic proposal is consistently and logically anchored to these interests in accordance with their priority level.</p>	<p>Presentation clearly identifies U.S. national interests within their ocean region.</p> <p>National interests are prioritized, but strategic proposal has loose and inconsistent connections to the interests and prioritization.</p>	<p>Presentation identifies some U.S. national interests within their ocean region.</p> <p>National interests are NOT prioritized.</p>	<p>Presentation does not identify U.S. national interests within their ocean region.</p>
<b>Regional Strategic Estimate</b>	<p>Acknowledging time limitations, the presentation provides a comprehensive overview of the ocean regional security environment including military, economic, political, and social, and environmental issues. Estimate is presented in near (0-2 year) and mid-term (3-8 year) timelines.</p> <p>U.S. strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in</p>	<p>The presentation provides a broad overview of the ocean regional security environment including military, economic and political issues. Estimate is presented in near (0-2 year) and mid-term (3-8 year) timelines.</p> <p>U.S. strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in the ocean region are clearly identified.</p>	<p>The presentation provides a partial overview of the ocean regional security environment but fails to examine key areas of emphasis contained in the National Security Strategy.</p> <p>Strategic estimate focuses only on military challenges within the region.</p> <p>U.S. strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats are NOT identified.</p>	<p>The presentation fails to provide an overview of the ocean regional security environment or fails to communicate how identified trends or concerns directly impact U.S. national security interests.</p>



# TSDM – FX-08

## Seminar Presentation Grading



	<p>the ocean region are clearly identified.</p> <p>The likelihood and severity of threats and challenges is considered and communicated.</p> <p>Regional impact to U.S. global strategy and possible seams and challenges to interagency and whole of government efforts are considered and communicated.</p>	<p>Regional impact to U.S. global strategy is considered and communicated.</p>	<p>Regional impact to U.S. global strategy is NOT considered.</p>	
<b>Theater Strategy Outline</b>	<p>The seminar clearly presents desired theater conditions for both near (0-2 year) and medium (3-8 year) time frames. Desired conditions consider the likelihood and severity of threats and challenges identified in strategic estimate.</p> <p>Heading-level detail is provided through concise descriptions of desired conditions within the theater.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is provided through concepts (ways) that comprehensively describe activities, required resources, actors, processes, and policy implications necessary to accomplish strategic heading-level objectives. Risk to each concept is presented and mitigation is discussed.</p> <p>Methods by which primary CCMD staff could effectively coordinate and contribute to whole of government concepts and address seams between other CCMDs in the region are presented.</p> <p>Strategy closely aligns with existing U.S. strategic guidance.</p>	<p>The seminar presents desired theater conditions for both near (0-2 year) and medium (3-8 year) time frames. Desired conditions consider the likelihood and severity of threats and challenges identified in strategic estimate.</p> <p>Heading-level detail is provided through effective descriptions of desired conditions within the theater.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is provided through concepts (ways) that describe some activities, required resources, actors, processes, and policy implications necessary to accomplish strategic heading-level objectives. Risk to each concept is presented but mitigation is NOT discussed.</p> <p>Methods by which primary CCMD staff could effectively coordinate and contribute to whole of government concepts are presented.</p> <p>Strategy aligns with existing U.S. strategic guidance.</p>	<p>The seminar presents desired theater conditions but fails to break conditions into near and medium range timelines. Desired conditions are idealistic and do not consider likelihood and severity of threats and challenges.</p> <p>Heading-level detail is provided through vague bullet titles that do not effectively convey strategic objectives.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is provided through concepts (ways) that describe activities, required resources and actors, but fail to consider process or policy implications. Risk to each concept is NOT presented.</p> <p>No effective consideration to integration or coordination between interagency partners or other regional CCMDs is considered or presented.</p> <p>Strategy does not align with existing U.S. strategic guidance.</p>	<p>The seminar presents desired conditions that are well outside the 8-year horizon, are idealistic, and do not consider likelihood and severity of threats and challenges.</p> <p>Heading-level detail is provided through ineffective one-word titles.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is NOT presented or is presented in a single phrase without amplifying details in narration.</p> <p>Strategy drastically departs from existing U.S. strategic guidance.</p>
<b>Required Capabilities</b>	<p>The seminar presents four capabilities (Means) required to carry out its regional strategy. Capabilities are presented in a defensible prioritized order with clear, logical connections to elements of strategic proposal.</p> <p>DoD-centric capabilities are conceptualized across the DOTMLPF-P with descriptions</p>	<p>The seminar presents four capabilities (Means) required to carry out its regional strategy. Capabilities are presented in a defensible prioritized order with clear, logical connections to elements of strategic proposal.</p> <p>Seminar communicates how capabilities would be employed in the field but does not consider or present how capabilities would be</p>	<p>The seminar presents four capabilities (Means) required to carry out its regional strategy. Capabilities are NOT presented in a defensible prioritized order and are NOT clearly tied to elements of their strategic proposal.</p>	<p>The seminar fails to present four distinct capabilities or fails to connect all four capabilities to their strategic proposal.</p>



# TSDM – FX-08

## Seminar Presentation Grading



	<p>of how the capability would be employed in the field and how the capabilities would progress through the JCIDS process lanes.</p> <p>Whole of government capabilities are presented with consideration of actors and processes used to attain the capability, as well as whether regional CDR staff is required to effectively coordinate across the interagency to integrate the capability in the region.</p>	<p>acquired (no mention of actors or processes necessary to realize required capabilities.)</p>		
<b>Effective Organization, Timing, and Delivery</b>	<p>Presentation has a clearly identifiable Golden Thread (logical connective theme) that consistently ties all elements together and ensures cohesion between interests, strategic estimate, desired conditions, strategy, and required capabilities. Helps ensure audience retention and impact.</p> <p>Verbal transitions between elements and speakers are smooth and efficient.</p> <p>A minimum total of 3 different speakers are utilized (2 in Phase One, 1 in Two)</p> <p>Presenters speak clearly with minimal verbal pauses and minimize distracting movement or body language.</p> <p>The brief is completed within allotted 30 minutes.</p>	<p>Presentation is organized in a clear, logical, and effective manner.</p> <p>An overarching theme or title is presented but is NOT effectively used throughout the presentation to provide a cohesive Golden Thread. The audience is left guessing about the main take away from the strategic proposal or is confused about how the different elements support the Golden Thread.</p> <p>A minimum total of 3 different speakers are utilized (2 in Phase One, 1 in Phase Two)</p> <p>One or more native English-speaking presenters struggle with verbal pauses or are ineffective in their delivery of narration.</p> <p>The brief is completed in no more than 31 minutes.</p>	<p>The presentation is organized in a logical manner (A-B-C-D), but no overall theme is developed or presented, and some elements are disconnected from one another.</p> <p>Fewer than 3 different speakers are utilized (2 in Phase One and 1 in Phase Two)</p> <p>Presenters do not demonstrate evidence they have rehearsed their script or effectively prepared for their speaking role.</p> <p>The brief takes more than 31 minutes to complete.</p>	<p>The presentation is not organized in a logical manner and separate elements are not clearly identifiable.</p> <p>The brief takes more than 32 minutes to complete.</p>
<b>Effective Style and Format</b>	<p>Slides use the provided template.</p> <p>Written portions are free from grammatical or spelling errors.</p> <p>All tables, graphs, or images are sized to allow the audience to read and understand the content.</p> <p>Slides are not overcrowded and make use of white space to allow for effective visual communication in concert with spoken narration.</p>	<p>Slides use the provided template.</p> <p>Written portions contain minor grammatical or spelling errors.</p> <p>Most tables, graphs, or images are sized to allow the audience to read and understand the content.</p> <p>Some slides are overcrowded and would benefit from additional white space.</p>	<p>Slides do not use the provided template.</p> <p>Written portions contain significant grammatical or spelling errors.</p> <p>Tables, graphs, or images are too small to be read by the audience.</p>	<p>Slides are a disaster and completely detract from the seminar's attempt to communicate their strategic proposal.</p>



# TSDM – FX-08

## Seminar Presentation Grading



<b>Phase Two: Critical Analysis and Policy Response Analysis (15 Minutes Allowed)</b>				
<b>Critical Analysis</b>	<p>The seminar applies a thorough and effective process of critical analysis against their strategic proposal.</p> <p>A methodology is developed or utilized to ensure a wholistic examination of all elements of their strategic proposal.</p> <p>Strengths AND weaknesses are clearly and evenly identified and discussed as appropriate.</p> <p>Blind spots are considered and presented.</p> <p>Possible opportunities are identified in relation to strengths, while possible mitigation efforts against weakness are presented.</p>	<p>The seminar applies a process of critical analysis against their strategic proposal.</p> <p>One or more elements of the strategic proposal are omitted from critical analysis.</p> <p>Strengths OR weaknesses are excessively highlighted at the cost or neglect of the other category.</p> <p>Possible opportunities are identified in relation to strengths, while possible mitigation efforts against weakness are presented.</p> <p>Blind spots are NOT considered or discussed.</p>	<p>The seminar provides a shallow analysis of their strategic proposal considering the events of the reframing moment.</p> <p>Simplistic conclusions are drawn such as “we got it all right”, or “we should probably scrap the whole thing and start over.”</p>	<p>The seminar does not conduct a critical analysis of their strategic proposal or demonstrates the inability to apply critical analysis techniques learned and applied in the course curriculum (specifically FPA case study analysis) against their own strategic proposal.</p>
<b>Policy Response Analysis</b>	<p>The seminar selects the one policy option they believe is most likely to be selected by the administration.</p> <p>International, organizational, AND individual factors are considered and used to explain why a policy option was selected as the most likely choice. Second-level factor analysis and evidence is provided to justify choice.</p> <p>The same factors are used to explain why the other two policy options were NOT selected as the most likely choice.</p>	<p>The seminar selects the one policy option they believe is most likely to be selected by the administration.</p> <p>International, organizational, OR individual factors are considered and used to explain why a policy option was selected.</p> <p>Minimal justification for non-selection of policy options is provided.</p>	<p>The seminar selects the one policy option they believe is most likely to be selected by the administration.</p> <p>Minimal justification for selection is provided.</p> <p>No justification for non-selection is provided.</p>	<p>The seminar selects the one policy option they believe is most likely to be selected by the administration.</p> <p>No justification for selection or non-selection is provided.</p>
<b>Effective Organization and Timing</b>	<p>The brief is completed within the allotted 15 minutes.</p> <p>Both Phase Two elements are provided sufficient time for all desired points to be made.</p>	<p>The brief is completed in no more than 16 minutes.</p> <p>Poor time management results in one of the two Phase Two elements being cut short or insufficiently presented due to lack of time.</p>	<p>Brief takes more than 16 minutes to complete.</p>	<p>Brief takes more than 17 minutes to complete.</p>
<b>Effective Style and Format</b>	<p>Slides use the provided template.</p> <p>Written portions are free from grammatical or spelling errors.</p> <p>All tables, graphs, or images are sized to allow the audience to read and understand the content.</p>	<p>Slides use the provided template.</p> <p>Written portions contain minor grammatical or spelling errors.</p> <p>Most tables, graphs, or images are sized to allow the audience to read and understand the content.</p>	<p>Slides do not use the provided template.</p> <p>Written portions contain significant grammatical or spelling errors.</p> <p>Tables, graphs, or images are too small to be read by the audience.</p>	<p>Slides are a disaster and completely detract from the seminar’s attempt to communicate their strategic proposal.</p>



## TSDM – FX-08

### Seminar Presentation Grading



	Slides are not overcrowded and make use of white space to allow for effective visual communication in concert with spoken narration.	Some slides are overcrowded and would benefit from additional white space.		
<b>Question and Answers (30 Minutes)</b>				
<b>Question and Answer Execution</b>	<p>Seminar members effectively answer all questions in a clear and concise manner. The seminar employs a question fielding strategy that makes efficient use of time and seminar member knowledge.</p> <p>The seminar avoids piling on to one question, allowing one to three members to contribute to the answer, while leaving ample time for additional questions from the panel.</p> <p>The seminar ensures participation of all members in either the presentation speaking roles or the question-and-answer period.</p>	<p>Seminar members effectively answer all questions in a clear and concise manner.</p> <p>The seminar allows 4 or more people to provide an answer to a single question to demonstrate participation. This strategy may reduce the panel's number of questions asked and should not be utilized.</p> <p>One or two seminar members fail to participate in either the presentation speaking roles or the question-and-answer period.</p>	<p>Seminar members do not answer one or two of the panel's questions in a satisfactory manner and demonstrate significant gaps in knowledge of key TSDM course concepts.</p> <p>More than two seminar members do not participate in either presentation speaking roles or the question-and-answer period.</p>	<p>Seminar members fail to answer 50 percent of the panel's questions in an effective manner and demonstrate a lack of knowledge and understanding of TSDM course concepts.</p>

#### Required Preparation

- Entirety of Foreign Policy Analysis and International Security curricula.





## TSDM – FX-09

### Course Conclusion

---

#### **Focus**

This optional final session is designed to give students and teaching teams the opportunity to wrap-up the Final Exercise and TSDM course in-person after seminars complete the presentation competition.

#### **Outcomes**

- Reflect on TSDM course concepts and learning objectives.
- Discuss Final Exercise presentation and grading panel feedback.

#### **Session Guidance**

- Seminars will coordinate with their faculty teaching team regarding the conduct, time, and location of TSDM FX-09. Seminars must have completed their Final Exercise presentation and received their grade and feedback from the grading panel prior to conducting FX-09.

#### **Required Preparation**

- None