



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

Joint Professional Military Education Phase II Senior Level Course

College of Naval Warfare and Naval Command College

NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING

February 2025 - May 2025



NSA
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT
OF
STATE

Table of Contents

Course Overview and Policies.....	04
Course Objectives	04
Learning Outcomes.....	04
Course Framework.....	05
Course Organization.....	05
Course Requirements.....	05
Grading Standards	08
Grade Appeals.....	10
Plagiarism and the use of ChatGPT and Similar Intelligence Software	10
Seminar Assignments and General Schedule.....	11
Faculty Office Hours.....	12
NSA Department Key Personnel	12
NSDM-01: Course Introduction.....	13
FPA-01: Foreign Policy Analysis for Practitioners	14
IS-01: International Security for Practitioners.....	15
FPA-2: Intro Case Study: 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: U.S. Constitutional System	20
IS-4: Political Economy	21
FPA-5: Cognitive & Palace Politics Perspectives	22
IS-5: Deterrence Theory.....	23
FPA-6: The President & The White House	24
IS-6: Strategic Deterrence.....	25
FPA-7: Organizational Process and Bureaucratic Politics Perspective	26
IS-7: Grand Strategy I: Primacy and Liberal Internationalism	27
FPA-8: The National Security Bureaucracy.....	28
IS-8: Grand Strategy II: Selective Engagement and Retrenchment.....	29
FPA-9: The Interagency Process	30
IS-9: Strategic Challenges I: Geopolitical	31
FPA-10: The Interagency Simulation-Lorica	32
IS-10: Strategic Challenge II: Transnational.....	33
FPA-11: Congress I: Structure, Processes and Legislative Oversight.....	34
IS-11: National Security Strategy	35
FPA-12: Congress II: Power, Polarization, and the Politics of Lawmaking	36
IS-12: Defense Strategy	37
FPA-13: Media and Public Opinion.....	38
IS-13: Maritime Strategy	39
FPA-14: External Influencers: Think Tanks, Interest Groups and Lobbyists.....	40

IS-14: Strategic Risk I: Joint Force Employment	41
FPA-15: Defense Budget, Acquisitions, and Innovation	43
IS-15: Strategic Risk II: Joint Force Development and Design	44
FPA-16: Using Diplomacy.....	45
IS-16: Indo Pacific	46
FPA-17: Using Information	47
IS-17: Europe.....	48
FPA 18: Using Military Force.....	49
IS-18: Greater Middle East and Central Asia	50
FPA-19: Using Economic Statecraft	51
IS-19: Africa	52
FPA-20: Case Study Analysis: Taiwan Scenario.....	53
IS-20: Western Hemisphere.....	54
NSDM FX-01: The Final Exercise Introduction	55
NSDM FX-02 through FX-08: Seminar Product Development	56
NSDM FX-09: FX Seminar Presentation Review.....	59
NSDM FX-10: Seminar Presentation Grading	61

NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING (NSDM) COURSE

1. COURSE OVERVIEW AND ADMINISTRATION

The National Security Decision Making (NSDM) course is designed to challenge senior-level students to engage with the dynamic complexities of today's rapidly evolving national and international security environment. The NSDM curriculum covers an array of national security issues, giving particular emphasis to understanding U.S. decision making dynamics at the strategic level. The course is designed to broaden strategic perspectives while fostering critical thinking and analytic skills that will have lasting professional relevance by understanding the drivers of U.S. foreign policy and the role the United States plays in the world.

- a. **Course Objectives.** Our goal is to provide an educational experience that combines conceptual rigor and professional relevance in order to prepare students to be more effective participants in the decision-making environment of any major national security organization. The intended outcome of this graduate-level course is to foster the regional awareness, strategic perspectives, critical thinking, and analytic rigor that are needed by national security professionals working at the national-strategic level. Our course learning outcomes include:
 - i. Evaluate global security issues to develop national strategies
 - ii. Analyze factors involved in the national security policymaking processes that influence U.S. interests in global affairs
 - iii. Communicate strategic arguments and ideas in appropriate professional ways
- b. **Learning Outcomes.** The NSDM course supports the following Naval War College CNW program learning outcomes:
 - i. Demonstrate joint-warfighting leadership when integrating the instruments of national power across the continuum of competition.
 - ii. Create national security strategies designed for contemporary and future security environments.
 - iii. Apply the organizational and ethical concepts integral to the profession of arms to national and multinational strategic decision-making.
 - iv. Apply theory, history, doctrine, and sea power through critical, strategic

c. **Course Framework.** The course follows the logic of analyzing national security through two sub-courses: *International Security* (providing the international strategic context with a grand strategy focus that guides U.S. foreign policy) and *Foreign Policy Analysis* (focusing on U.S. national and organizational decision-making environments that underlie foreign policy decisions). The last two weeks of the course will be dedicated to a capstone event entitled the *Final Exercise (FX)*. Each seminar will act as a national security working group to produce and present an executive-level strategic estimate of the security environment over the next twenty years. From that estimate, the seminar will develop an outline of national and military strategies to advance and defend national interests and describe the details associated with implementing an aspect of that strategy. Additionally, the seminar will develop joint force structure implications that support their security estimate and nested strategies.

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

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| i. NSDM (lecture and seminar) | 1 Session |
| ii. International Security (seminars) | 20 Sessions |
| iii. Foreign Policy Analysis (seminars) | 20 Sessions |
| iv. NSDM Final Exercise (FX) (course-wide capstone) | 9 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. NSDM 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. Recommended readings may also be listed to provide background for those who do not possess adequate knowledge to understand the required readings.

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

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

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

vi. *Summative Assignments.* * An overall NSDM grade will be assigned to CNW 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 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.

Assignments are time released on Blackboard in the shared course, BBCRS1.CNW.NSDM.SH, under the heading “Assignment Guidance” then under the assignment title. Professors will announce the exact time of assignment release in class.

***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 NSDM FX. This grade will be determined by a three-member faculty team and assigned to the seminar as a group.

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

Sub-course	Requirement	Type/Basis of Evaluation	Due Date	Weight
Foreign Policy Analysis	Graded Exam	Individual. Ability to comprehend course topics.	28 Mar 25	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 NSDM course.	09 May 25	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. Read ahead and Case study analysis distributed 16 May 2023	16 May 25	25%
NSDM	Seminar Preparation and Contribution*	Individual. Preparedness and individual contributions in the seminar.	Cumulative	15%
FX	Capstone Group Presentation	Seminar. Ability of seminar to apply all three sub-course concepts and present a coherent, professional presentation reflecting the seminar’s theater strategic guidance.	03 June 25	15%

vii. *Return Dates.* Grades will be returned to students by close of business as follows:

Foreign Policy Analysis Exam	14 April 2025
International Security Analytic Research Paper	23 May 2025
Foreign Policy Analysis Final Exam	30 May 2025
NSDM Seminar Contribution	03 June 2025
NSDM FX	03 June 2025

f. **Grading Standards.** Grades for all NSDM 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 percent As and 55-65 percent Bs and below is commonly achieved by the overall NWC student population. While variations from this norm might occur from seminar to seminar and subject to subject, it will rarely reach an overall A to B-and-below ratio of greater than or equal to an even fifty-fifty distribution.”

Rubric of 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-<97	
A-	90-<94	
B+	87-<90	Expected performance of the average graduate student.
B	84-<87	
B-	80-<84	
C+	77-<80	Below the average performance expected for graduate work.
C	74-<77	
C-	70-<74	
D+	67-<70	Well below the average performance expected for graduate work.
D	64-<67	
D-	60-<64	
F	0-<60	Unsatisfactory work.

Rubric of common standards for numeric and associated letter grades for individual seminar preparation/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 NSDM 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 or completely unprepared for seminar.

FINAL NSDM COURSE GRADE: Grades assigned for all NSDM 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. Two faculty members are assigned to a seminar's teaching team with each leading individual sessions for the two parallel sub-courses. Seminar, teaching team and classroom assignments are published separately.

Sub-course seminar sessions normally meet in the afternoons on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Mondays will normally be reserved for Elective classes and Fridays are normally reserved for student preparation. Individual class sessions are normally 90 minutes long (except for a few sessions covering topics that require more time). Course-wide lectures or panel discussions featuring guest speakers will occasionally occur on Fridays. These normally involve 90 minutes with all students and faculty hearing from and engaging the speaker in an auditorium setting. 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.** Faculty members are 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 provide informal curricular or instructional feedback. Faculty members are available outside of class hours, either on-line or in person, throughout the week. Because professors also teach electives and perform other activities, students are encouraged to arrange appointments beforehand whenever possible.

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
Derek.Reveron@usnwc.edu

NSA Department Deputy Chair Prof.

Dana Struckman
Room: C-318
Tel: 401-856-5312
Dana.Struckman@usnwc.edu

NSA Department Academic Program Manager

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

NSDM International Security Sub-course Director

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

NSDM Foreign Policy Analysis Sub-course Director

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

NSDM Final Exercise (FX) Coordinator

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



NSDM-01

Course Introduction

Focus

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

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

Outcomes

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

Discussion Questions

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

Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- Jones, James L. 2018. "Foreword: U.S. National Security for the Twenty-First Century." In *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security*, by Derek S. Reveron, edited by Nikolas K. Gvosdev, Derek S. Reveron, and John A. Cloud
- Gates, Robert M. *Exercise of Power: American Failures, Successes, and a New Path Forward in the Post-Cold War World*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2020), Chapter 1 (pp. 13-57).
- Jim Cook. 'How We Do Strategy as Performance up at Newport'. War on the Rocks. March 18, 2019.
- Reveron, Derek S. 2024. 'US Foreign Policy Beyond 2025'. *Orbis (Philadelphia)* 68 (4): 545–67.
- Hardt, Brent. "NWC Talks: What on Earth is the Liberal International Order?" YouTube video. 18:03. Nov 13, 2019.
- "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 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 the world and how does this change using multiple perspectives? Finally, how does the United States prioritize which regions of the world matter most for its national security? Over the next twelve weeks, we explore these questions to appreciate the security environment, the sources of national power, and the importance of national strategy and interests. Because of 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.

Outcomes

- Grasp the fundamental questions that a practitioner must assess when analyzing U.S. national security.
- 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.
- Analyze the dimensions of national power and their role in shaping strategy.

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 dividing the world into regions help?
- When designing strategy, how can a country achieve balance with the various tools of national power and 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.
- 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 video, 15 min.
- Brands, Hal. “The Overstretched Superpower.” *Foreign Affairs*, 18 January 2022.
- Spektor, Matias. "In defense of the fence sitters: what the west gets wrong about hedging." *Foreign Affairs* 102, no.8, 2023.



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, G. John. "Why American Power Endures: The U.S.-Led Order Isn't in Decline." *Foreign Affairs* 101, no. 6, 2022.



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.



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. Feminist approaches are a variety of constructivist approaches that focus on a particular set of issues in constructing understandings of the world. 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 feminist approaches to analyze security, war, and peace, offer a different 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)
- Cohen, Dara Kay, and Sabrina M Karim. "Does More Equality for Women Mean Less War? Rethinking Sex and Gender Inequality and Political Violence." *International Organization* 76, no. 2 (2022): 414–44.



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 21st 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.
- Examine 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.
- 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 video, 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 organizational process perspective and bureaucratic 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

Grand Strategy I: Primacy and Liberal Internationalism

Focus

To what extent does the United States need to shape global developments to secure its national interests? How far out should its security zone extend? To what extent do the domestic affairs of others concern the United States? With what tools of statecraft should the United States utilize as it engages with the rest of the world? Grand strategy attempts to provide a coherent framework for the extent and depth of U.S. global engagement as well as categorizing priorities and accepting risk. The following two sessions will provide an overview of the principal templates for U.S. grand strategy. We will examine grand strategies predicated on an expansive view of U.S. interests which call for active and forward U.S. engagement at a global level. Primacy argues the United States should be the agenda-setter of the international system. Liberal Internationalism calls for the U.S. to construct and invest in a durable order and recruit partners to help sustain it.

Outcomes

- Understand primacy and liberal internationalism as strategies of activism and engagement.
- Understand and comprehend the advantages and challenges posed by these grand strategies.
- Understand the domestic and international factors that make primacy or liberal internationalism attractive to the American national security community.
- Assess the risks to U.S. national security and to the durability of the current international order from these grand strategies.

Discussion Questions

- What is the purpose of grand strategy? How do grand strategies help translate interests into long-term goals and priorities? How do they create a narrative about the role and purpose of international engagement?
- What are some key advantages and disadvantages of primacy? How does liberal internationalism attempt to reconcile the outcomes of primacy with the burdens primacy imposes?
- What type of force structure is appropriate for activist grand strategies?
- How should rising powers be addressed by a grand strategy of primacy versus one of liberal internationalism?

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. (READ 44-48, from section titled "Searching for Grand Strategy" through "Approaches to Grand Strategy")
- Avey, Paul C., Jonathan N. Markowitz, and Robert J. Reardon. "Disentangling Grand Strategy: International Relations Theory and U.S. Grand Strategy." *Texas National Security Review* 2, no. 1 (2018).
- Brands, Hal. "Choosing Primacy: U.S. Strategy and Global Order and the Dawn of the Post-Cold War Era," *Texas National Security Review* 1, no. 2 (2018).
- Brands, Hal and Peter Feaver. "Stress-Testing American Grand Strategy." *Survival* 58:6 (2016).
- 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 – 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.
- Esper, Mark T. "Civilian Control and Reform of the Pentagon." In *A Sacred Oath: Memoirs of a Secretary of Defense During Extraordinary Times*, 83-111. New York: Harper Collins, 2022.
- 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

Grand Strategy II: Selective Engagement and Retrenchment

Focus

In the previous session we examined grand strategies of activism and forward U.S. engagement at the global level, based on an expansive view of U.S. interests and with a much lower tolerance for geopolitical risk. In this session, we will examine grand strategies of selective engagement and retrenchment, which argue against adopting an expansive view of American interests and shift the basis for U.S. action in the world from shaping environments to mitigating consequences. If primacy and liberal internationalism are both grand strategies that expect American global leadership and focus, the other main types of grand strategy call for greater selectivity in where, when, and under what conditions the United States engages with the rest of the world. These types are guided by a higher tolerance for geopolitical risk and rely more on regional partners. Selective engagement and retrenchment progressively have higher triggers for U.S. action both in terms of the severity of the threat, as well as its geographic provenance.

Outcomes

- Understand selective engagement and retrenchment as strategies of restraint.
- Understand the strategic assumptions for strategies based on selective engagement and retrenchment.
- Understand and comprehend the advantages and challenges posed by these grand strategies.
- Understand the domestic and international factors that make selective engagement or retrenchment attractive to the American national security community.
- Assess the risks to U.S. national security and to the durability of the current international order from these grand strategies.

Discussion Questions

- What factors might cause the United States to re-evaluate its level of global engagement?
- What are some key advantages and disadvantages of grand strategies of selective engagement and retrenchment?
- What type of force structure is appropriate for these types of grand strategy?
- Can the United States maintain a balance that favors its interests under conditions of selective engagement and retrenchment?

Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Priebe, Miranda, and Bryan Rooney, Nathan Beauchamp-Mustafaga, Jeffrey Martini, and Stephanie Pezard, *Implementing Restraint*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2021. (READ 1-26 and seminar will be assigned a subsequent chapter dealing with a specific region – Europe, Asia-Pacific, Middle East, or South Asia – SCAN for evidence of the restraint approach)
- Priebe, Miranda, Kristen Gunness, Karl P. Mueller and Zachary Brudette, *The Limits of Restraint*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2022. (READ 1-46)
- Brands, Hal, Peter Feaver and William Inboden. *Stress Testing American Grand Strategy II*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 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 Challenges I: Geopolitical

Focus

We will consider 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 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 43rd 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 - 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

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, and 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, 4th 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 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

National Security Strategy

Focus

Congress mandates the Executive Branch 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 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?
- 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.
- 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)
- *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 – 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. "Congress and the Launch 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

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.
- Examine the general process through which strategic guidance provided in the NSS, NDS, and NMS is used to inform and drive force planning.
- Assess 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 – 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*, 11-25. Cornell Univ. Press, 2022.
- Smeltz, Dina, et. al. *America’s Foreign Policy Future: Public Opinion and the 2024 Election*, Chicago Council on Global Affairs, November 2024. (READ 6 – 25 ONLY)



IS – 13

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

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

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*. London: Routledge, 2018. (READ 1-31)
- 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 – 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 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 there are any regions of the world without adequate 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 – 14

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)



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)

- The Debrief, Episode 15: "Strategy Meets Budget." U.S. Naval War College Video, 2024.
- 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.
- O'Hanlon, Michael E and Alejandra Rocha. "Strengthening America's defense industrial base," Brookings, 20 June 2024.



IS – 15

Strategic Risk II: Joint Force Development and Design

Focus

IS-14 introduced you to strategic risk and was focused on the near-term planning horizon, but what about maintaining advantage in the future? IS-15 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 developing the joint force and joint 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 law. You will examine the role of operating concepts in the JFDD and JCIDS processes during the Final Exercise.

Outcomes

- Understand JFDD begins with strategy, enables 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 strategic risk.
- Analyze crucial maritime concepts and capabilities required to achieve strategic JFDD ends.

Discussion Questions

- How 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?

Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- The NWC Talks: “Logic of Force Planning with Jim Cook.” U.S. Naval War College, 2019. YouTube, 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*, 4th 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)
- 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)



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.
- Evaluate 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.



IS – 16

Indo-Pacific

Focus

This session will consider the Indo-Pacific region, which the United States has important economic and security interests. Several issues raise questions regarding the region's future peace and stability, including how strategic competition plays out in the Indo-Pacific's various regions, the role and distinct interests of U.S. allies and partners, and concerns such as North Korea's nuclear-weapons program and general behavior. With the growth of economic and military power in the Indo-Pacific and the U.S. focus on the region, it is essential that national-security professionals have a clear understanding of the region's dynamics.

Outcomes

- Understand the foundations of this region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests.
- Identify the challenges to deterrence and 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 FX.

Discussion Questions

- What does it mean to have a "free and open" Indo-Pacific? What is your assessment (strengths and weaknesses) of the US regional strategy?
- How will US-PRC competition likely manifest in Southeast Asia? In other parts of the Indo-Pacific?
- How should the United States assess the growing geopolitical importance of the Pacific Islands?
- How is Japan's strategy evolving in light of emerging security challenges in East Asia?
- What is the future of the U.S.-Indian partnership, and what national interests do the two countries have in common? Looking to the future, what are the limits and opportunities in this relationship?
- What dangers does a nuclear-capable North Korea pose for the region? How should South Korea respond?

Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Blinken, Antony J. "A Free and Open Indo-Pacific." Speech at Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia, December 14, 2021.
- Le Thu, Huong. "Southeast Asia in Great-Power Competition: Between Asserting Agency and Muddling Through." In *Strategic Asia, 2021-22: Navigating Tumultuous Times in the Indo-Pacific*, edited by Ashley J. Tellis, Alison Szalwinski, and Michael Wills, 161-85. Seattle: The National Bureau of Asian Research, 2022.
- 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.
- Matsuda, Takuya. "Japan's Emerging Security Strategy." *The Washington Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (April 2023): 85-102.
- Markey, Daniel. "India as It Is: Washington and Delhi Share Interests, Not Values." *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2023.
- The NSA Debrief Episode 10: "Korea." U.S. Naval War College, 2024. YouTube video, 23 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.
- Evaluate 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.



IS – 17

Europe

Focus

The trans-Atlantic relationship between Europe and the United States 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. The trans-Atlantic maritime basin 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 this region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests.
- Identify the challenges to deterrence and 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 FX.

Discussion Questions

- The "trans-Atlantic" community initially started as a formulation to describe relations between Europe and North America. Is Europe still the most important relationship for the United States?
- How does the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) build a security community between the U.S. and Europe? How does the U.S. interact with other European institutions?
- To what extent is the eastward enlargement of the Euro-Atlantic community a necessity for U.S. national security?
- 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)

- 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).
- Hamilton, Daniel S. and Joseph P. Quinlan. *The Transatlantic Economy 2024*. Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, 2024. (READ Executive Summary (v-x) and Chapter 1 (1-13))
- *NATO 2022 Strategic Concept*, Adopted by Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Madrid 29 June 2022.
- European Union External Action Service. *2024 Progress Report on the Implementation of the Strategic Compass for Security and Defence*.



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.
- Evaluate 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.



IS – 18

Greater Middle East and Central Asia

Focus

While the National Defense Strategy prioritizes the Indo-Pacific and China as the pacing challenge, the Middle East continues to occupy a central role in U.S. foreign policy. U.S. national interests focus on energy security, access to critical minerals and rare earths, civil war spillage, refugee flows, and political instability. Historical challenges include: Israeli-Palestinian tensions, 1980 Carter Doctrine, Global War on Terror, 2011 Arab Awakening, Iranian and Saudi proxy battles for influence, persistence of the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict, and growing Chinese and Russian economic and military activities. Such issues mean the United States is still focused on promoting stability in the Greater Middle East (GMA) and Central Asia (CA) to ensure trade flows, combating violent non-state actors and extremism, and nuclear nonproliferation.

Outcomes

- Understand the foundations of this region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests.
- Identify the challenges to deterrence and 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 FX.

Discussion Questions

- Why is the GME and CA strategically important? Are there alternative ways of competing in the region?
- What issues threaten the region currently and for the future? What should be prioritized by the West?
- How will U.S. strategic engagement or disengagement in the region shape stability, relations, and security?
- What forms of military and economic assistance are effective in the region? Are there alternative approaches to improving regional security and stability in the GME and CA?
- What are the implications of strategic competitors (e.g., China, Russia, Turkey, etc.) gaining influence across the GME and CA? How can the U.S. better compete for influence to counter these actions?

Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Scheinmann, Gabriel. "The Map that Ruined the Middle East." *The Tower*, July 2013.
- Asi, Yara M., et. al. "Important Considerations for the Middle East in 2024." *Arab Center Washington DC*, January 10, 2024.
- Springborg, Robert, et. al. "Security Assistance in the Middle East: A Three Dimensional Chessboard." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, 2020.
- "Central Asia: What to Watch in 2024." *SpecialEurasia*, January 9, 2024.
- Šćepanović, Janko. "The Sheriff and the Banker? Russia and China in Central Asia." *War on the Rocks*, June 13, 2022.



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 economic statecraft 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.
- Evaluate 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.



IS – 19

Africa

Focus

Countries in Africa have long been an afterthought from the perspective of strategic thinkers in Washington D.C. African countries are usually overlooked, dealt with only in crisis (although often still overlooked then), and addressed in ways that are inconsistent and having more to do with bureaucratic interest and selective U.S. constituencies who care strongly about one issue or another. This haphazard approach is short sighted for many reasons, including the fact that over the next twenty years African youth will account for a large portion of the net labor-force growth in the world and many of the minerals necessary for the world economy are found in Africa. In addition, while the United States might place a low priority on African affairs, other countries do not. This session is designed to introduce students to some of the key strategic issues and debates concerning the region.

Outcomes

- Understand the foundations of this region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests.
- Identify the challenges to deterrence and 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 FX.

Discussion Questions

- What are U.S. interests in Africa? What are the most important strategic challenges, threats and opportunities to U.S. interests in Africa?
- From the perspective of African leaders, what are their most pressing priorities and where is this consistent with or in opposition to U.S. priorities?
- To what extent does great power competition impact African countries? How does the activities of China and Russia have an impact on the relationship between the United States and African countries?
- How do important global issues (such as climate change, migration), regional issues (such as terrorism, maritime security) and domestic issues (such as military coups) impact security in the region?

Required Preparation (Readings, Videos, Podcasts)

- Goldstone, Jack A. and John F. May. "The Global Economy's Future Depends on Africa." *Foreign Affairs*, 18 May 2023.
- Chin, John J., and Haleigh Bartos. "Rethinking US Africa Policy Amid Changing Geopolitical Realities." *Texas National Security Review* 7, no. 2 (2024): 114-132.
- Murithi, Tim. "Order of Oppression: Africa's Quest for a New International System." *Foreign Affairs*. 102, no.8, 2023.
- Singh, Naunihal. "The Myth of Coup Contagion," *Journal of Democracy*, October 2022.
- Kardon, Isaac. "Episode 6: Maritime Competition in African Waters." *Sea Power Podcast* 6 (2023).
- The NSA Debrief Episode 9: "Africa." U.S. Naval War College, 2023. YouTube video, 14 min.



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.
- Assess and 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*, 315–338. 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

Western Hemisphere

Focus

The Western Hemisphere is one of the most important and influential parts of the world with respect to global security and economic development. Defense of the U.S. homeland should be front and center of any strategy and account for strategic challenges close to home. One challenge seldom mentioned is countries of the region, particularly in the Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), have experienced U.S. military interventions creating an onerous environment for U.S. foreign policy. U.S. policymakers must accept the new “diplomatic competitiveness” as a more sophisticated Latin America increasingly engages partners such as China, India, Russia and Iran. The challenge for the United States is to implement policies that both respect the growing economic and political independence of Latin America and protect the U.S. homeland from regional insecurity.

Outcomes

- Understand the foundations of this region and the importance of the region to U.S. national interests.
- Identify the challenges to deterrence and 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 FX.

Discussion Questions

- What are the U.S. interests in the Western Hemisphere? How should the U.S. prioritize this region?
- How do you assess great power competition in the Western Hemisphere? What strategies and elements of national power should the U.S. utilize to counter China and Russia? Is China’s influence overstated?
- How should the United States respond to transnational security challenges such as criminal cartels, migration, trade, climate change and economic issues to increase regional stability?
- How does LAC’s colonial history shape contemporary regional, political and cultural characteristics?

Preparation (Readings, Videos, and Podcasts)

- Zimmerman, Rebecca. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs. *Statement Before the House Armed Services Committee*. 12 March 2024.
- Richardson, Laura J. (General). Commander, United States Southern Command. “United States Southern Command Strategy.” 2 January 2023.
- Ellis, Evan. *Testimony Before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, Migration, and International Economic Policy*. Hearing on "Russia in the Western Hemisphere: Assessing Putin's Malign Influence in Latin America and the Caribbean." 20 July 2022.
- Kline, Harvey F., and Christine J. Wade. 2022. *Latin American Politics and Development*. Taylor and Francis. (SCAN 1. The Context of Latin American Politics and 2. A Brief History of Latin America. READ 6. Latin America and the United States.)



NSDM FX-01

The Final Exercise Introduction

Focus

The Final Exercise (FX) is the NSDM capstone event where students must demonstrate that they understand and can apply concepts from the International Security and Foreign Policy Analysis sub-courses. Each seminar will play the role of a National Security Council strategic planning working group tasked with developing and presenting a presentation that covers the requirements listed below.

Outcomes

- Work together as a team to effectively demonstrate conceptual understanding of NSDM course (IS and FPA) concepts through completion of the Final Exercise.

Session Guidance

- Your working group is assigned to produce and present a global strategic estimate of the future security environment over the near (0-5 years), medium (5-15 years), and long (15-20 years) term, an outline of a National Security Strategy with sub-heading level detail outlining two non-DoD focused strategic concepts, an outline of a National Military Strategy with sub-heading level detail outlining two DoD-focused Joint Concepts, and a vision of the required future Joint Force. Finally, in the implementation case, the seminar must choose one aspect of their NSS or NMS outlines or an element of their required future joint force and describe in detail how the initiative would be executed or accomplished.
- The output will be a brief between 40 and 45 minutes in length that includes the five elements outlined above, followed by a 30-min Q&A period. Seminars will designate a minimum of two briefers for the presentation. All students are expected to participate in the Q&A.
- The teaching team will serve as consultants to the seminar throughout the Final Exercise but will not direct the seminar's efforts. Seminars must complete a rehearsal of their brief with their consultant team no later than the Seminar Presentation Review (FX-09). This rehearsal is a near-final product review after which the faculty consultant team will provide in-depth feedback to the seminar.
- For presentation grading, seminars will present their strategic proposal to a faculty grading panel. Time and location of the final presentation and grading panel members will be provided by the FX Director during product development.
- The grading panel will evaluate the seminar's ability to clearly communicate their strategic proposal in oral and visual forms. The panel will utilize the Final Exercise presentation rubric provided in the FX-10 syllabus page as a descriptive (NOT prescriptive) guide in their evaluation. Because the NSDM Final Exercise is designed as a team-based exercise, each seminar receives one grade that applies to all seminar members.

Required Preparation

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



NSDM FX-02 through FX-08

Seminar Product Development

Focus

Throughout this course, students have learned concepts, skills, and substantive information about the global security environment. Armed with this knowledge, the seminar will work as a team to produce a global strategic assessment over the next twenty years, develop an outline of a national security strategy with two associated strategic concepts, develop an outline national military strategy with two DoD-focused Joint Concepts, develop a vision of the future Joint Force that supports the proposed strategy, and choose one aspect of their strategic proposal to discuss in finer detail through their implementation case. The seminar must work collaboratively to develop these deliverables and ensure all members of the team contribute to the final product.

Outcomes

- Create a 40–45-minute oral and visual presentation that outlines the seminar’s global strategic estimate, outline NSS and NMS with four embedded strategic concepts, a vision of the required future joint force, and an implementation case.

Session Guidance

- Global Strategic Estimate:
 - The seminar is not bound by current strategic documents and should determine its own national priorities and preferences while remaining mindful of enduring U.S. values. The seminar should understand the security environment and consider contributions of all instruments of national power. The seminar should evaluate the major trends that may challenge the U.S. government's ability to advance and defend those interests over the near (0-5 years), medium (5-15 years), and long (15-20 years) term. Consider what is happening in terms of demographics, economics, politics, the environment, etc.
 - Where might U.S. interests align with those of other actors, and where might there be tension?
 - Consider both the likelihood and the severity of various potentially negative global or regional events/trends.
 - It may be helpful to determine elements of your seminar’s proposed National Security Strategy first to provide a more focused lens through which to conduct your strategic estimate.
- Outline National Security Strategy:
 - Having determined which trends and actors the United States would like to influence, the seminar will develop an outline of a national security strategy.
 - What is the seminar's vision or desired strategic condition (Ends) for the world in each time period? The purpose for the near, medium, and long-term analysis lenses is to encourage the seminar to think about threat not just in terms of likelihood and severity, but urgency and order of occurrence.
 - Describe and discuss two non-DoD focused strategic concepts the U.S. government could employ (Ways) required to achieve the seminar’s strategic objectives. This is the sub-heading level detail of your outline. Be sure to identify the lead agency and key stakeholders



NSDM FX-02 through FX-08

Seminar Product Development

within each concept. Capabilities required to carry out these concepts should be identified/discussed. To provide even more in-depth detail, one of these concepts may be used as the focus of your implementation case.

- Which other actors will the United States need to influence to arrive at this end-state? What forms of leverage might the United States have over these actors? How can the United States exert that leverage at the least cost/risk?
- Outline National Military Strategy:
 - The seminar will formulate an outline for a National Military Strategy (NMS) that broadly describes how the military instrument of power will be utilized to advance and defend the national interests outlined in their National Security Strategy.
 - Describe and discuss two DoD-focused Joint Concepts the military could employ (Ways) to achieve the seminar's strategic objectives. This is the sub-heading level detail of your outline. Identification and discussion of Concept Required Capabilities should be included. To provide even more in-depth detail, one of these concepts may be used as the focus of your implementation case.
 - Review Professor Jim Cook's article, "The Importance of Joint Concepts for the Planner" for historical examples of Joint Force operating concepts.
 - The seminar should be sure to consider inherent risks contained within the proposed military strategic approach. De-risking and offsetting should be considered and discussed given the need to balance and conduct "ruthless prioritization" when it comes to campaigning and development of the future force.
- Vision of Future Joint Force:
 - Develop a conceptual Joint Force that supports the NSS and NMS and can achieve the strategic objectives assigned to the military. Here, you should describe broad strategic and operational force characteristics required to support the NSS/NMS/operating concepts. Be sure to address issues of divestment and investment (which platforms would you eliminate? Which capabilities would you seek?), modernization (where would you focus R&D? Which types of platforms need a next-generation upgrade and why?), organization (is the U.S. military organized well to deal with future threats?), and any other aspect of force planning that you think supports your NSS/NMS/operating concepts.
 - You should focus on the strategic appropriateness of your proposed force, but you must be aware of the political and budgetary feasibility issues it would entail. Furthermore, you should consider the risks, obstacles, and tradeoffs over the near, medium, and long term associated with realizing your future force concept. You should expect your grading panel to ask you policy-relevant questions about how you would justify your proposed force concept to, e.g., members of Congress. The seminar should be able to persuade the grading panel that they have considered likely obstacles to their plan and have a reasonable argument that their plan is both necessary and feasible. This is likely to include a discussion of what trade-offs the seminar might propose to get their recommended force concept.



NSDM FX-02 through FX-08

Seminar Product Development

- Implementation Case:
 - Identify one of the more challenging or ambitious aspects of the seminar's ideas that would require the supporting efforts of a senior leader to facilitate its successful implementation. This might be one of the strategic concepts contained in the outline NSS or NMS, or perhaps a deeper look at one or more elements of the vision of the future joint force.
 - Based on the issue, the seminar should identify the senior leader charged with its implementation (for example, President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, CJCS, Service Chief, or Combatant Commander).
 - The seminar should clearly identify the relevant stakeholders (for example, Secretary of Defense, CJCS, Service Chiefs, Secretary of State, Congress, special interest groups, or foreign governments) that may oppose or support the initiative. What are their interests?
 - Address the full range of influences and obstacles associated with the implementation of the seminar's challenging or ambitious idea or innovation. The seminar must consider the influence of domestic politics and international relations (for example, organizational resistance, existing legislation or policies, industry sectors, media interest, lobbyists, or international norms).
 - Provide specific recommendations that explain how the senior leader could convince the relevant stakeholders to support the initiative's implementation. The recommendations should include a plan to overcome any identified opposition or obstacles, while directly addressing the stakeholders' interests (for example, the benefits of the initiative for the stakeholders).
 - Depending on the complexity of the initiative, the seminar's recommendations could include an implementation timeline or key milestones that describe specific actions that the senior leader would take to obtain necessary support.

Required Preparation

- James Cook. "The Importance of Joint Concepts for the Planner," *Joint Force Quarterly*, Issue 99, 4th Quarter 2020, pp. 95-100.



NSDM FX-09

Seminar Presentation Review

Focus

This session provides a dedicated time for the seminar to present their FX presentation to their faculty consultant team for feedback.

Outcomes

- Conduct a rehearsal of the seminar's FX presentation and receive feedback from the faculty consultant team.

Session Guidance

- This session concludes the preparation phase for the NSDM Final Exercise. The seminar should be prepared to present the briefing to their faculty consultant team in a format and manner which closely resembles the final product that will be graded.
- The seminar may choose, in consultation with their faculty team, to conduct this rehearsal prior to the date FX-09 is scheduled on the NSDM calendar.
- No later than this session's scheduled date, the seminar will complete NSDM FX product development by making desired changes to the presentation. After the final changes are made, and no later than 1600 on this session's scheduled date, seminars must electronically submit their presentation/brief to the FX Director and Deputy-Director. **This submission is NOT a read ahead for the grading panels. Seminars should present their FX presentation to their grading panels with the expectation that no read-ahead was provided.** Seminars are not allowed to make changes to their presentation slides after submitting their briefs to the FX Director. However, seminars are authorized to practice their briefs until their scheduled presentation and may edit or adjust the verbal portion as desired.

- FX Director: CDR Sean Mahoney, sean.mahoney@usnwc.edu
- FX Deputy Director: COL Justin Pritchard, justin.pritchard@usnwc.edu

Required Preparation

- None



NSDM FX-09

Seminar Presentation Review

PRESENTATION REHEARSAL CHECKLIST

CONTENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets FX requirements • Demonstrates clear understanding of NSDM course concepts • Five elements are aligned, consistent and mutually supporting • Innovative while aligning with enduring U.S. values • Seminar makes a strong case for feasibility 	
STRUCTURE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Material logically presented with an easily recognizable “Golden Thread” which ties the whole strategic proposal together from start to finish • Distinctly describes the five required elements • Key concepts evident • Strong concluding position 	
SUPPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credibility of material • Assumptions validated • Relevance to theme • Verbal / Visual Presentation synergy 	
STYLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuasively presented • Professional, engaging • Pace, tempo, clarity of delivery • Audience engagement • 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 	
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed within allotted time limit (45 min) • Responds well to questions • Managed discussion • Seminar participated in Q&A 	



NSDM FX-10

Seminar Presentation Grading

Focus

The seminar will deliver their FX presentation to an assigned faculty grading panel composed of one member of their own teaching team and two other NSA faculty members. Each grader will determine their individual score, and these three values will be averaged to determine the seminar’s final FX grade. A distinguished visitor with senior national government experience may also attend the brief. The DV will participate in the question-and-answer and feedback portions but will not have input to the seminar’s final grade.

Outcomes

- Effectively deliver a 40–45-minute presentation that covers the seminar’s global strategic estimate, outline National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy with associated strategic concepts, a vision of the future Joint Force, and an implementation case.
- Effectively answer questions asked by the faculty panel for 30 minutes in clear, articulate, and complete manner.

Presentation Grading Rubric

Please Note: This rubric is descriptive. It is not prescriptive, nor is it exhaustive. It provides seminars and faculty with insight regarding expected levels of performance and some examples of what would be seen in presentations at each level, but it is only a general set of guardrails. It cannot cover every course element that may be displayed in the Final Exercise, and it should not be utilized as a checklist.

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.
Letter Grade	A+ 97-100	B+ 87-89	C+ 77-79	D+ 67-69
Numeric Range	A 94-96	B 84-86	C 74-76	D 64-66
	A- 90-93	B- 80-83	C- 70-73	D- 60-63
NSDM Presentation (45 Minutes Allowed)				
Global Strategic Estimate	<p>Acknowledging time limitations, the presentation provides a comprehensive and logical overview of the global security environment including trends in military, economic, political, social, and environmental issues. Estimate is presented in near (0-5 year), mid-term (5-15 year), and long (15-20 year) timelines.</p> <p>Global regions are discussed in a prioritized order that clearly indicates the most strategically significant. Any omitted regions are identified and justified.</p> <p>U.S. strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats are clearly identified, including</p>	<p>The presentation provides a broad overview of the global security environment including military, economic and political issues. Estimate is presented in near (0-5 year), mid-term (5-15 year), and long (15-20 year) timelines.</p> <p>Global regions are discussed in a prioritized order that clearly indicates the most strategically significant.</p> <p>U.S. strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in different global regions are identified.</p>	<p>The presentation provides a shallow overview of the global security environment. Estimate is not presented in near-, medium- and long-term contexts.</p> <p>Strategic estimate focuses only on military challenges.</p>	<p>The presentation fails to provide an overview of the global security environment or fails to communicate how identified trends or concerns directly impact U.S. national security interests.</p>



NSDM FX-10

Seminar Presentation Grading



	<p>areas of alignment with regional actors and discussion of regional allies and partners.</p> <p>The likelihood and severity of threats and challenges are considered and communicated.</p> <p>Possible seams and challenges to interagency and whole of government efforts are considered and communicated.</p>			
Outline National Security Strategy	<p>The seminar clearly articulates the values, beliefs, or prioritized interests that form the foundation for their outline NSS.</p> <p>Integration of various IS sub course concepts such as IR Theory, Grand Strategy and Deterrence Theory is demonstrated.</p> <p>Integrating their global strategic estimate, the seminar clearly presents desired global conditions (Ends) for near (0-5 year), medium (5-15 year), and long (15-20 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 descriptive headers.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is provided through two non-DoD focused strategic concepts (Ways) that broadly describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - activities the U.S. government would employ to achieve NSS objectives - consideration of stakeholders, decision-makers, and processes - If applicable, identification and discussion of concept required capabilities (Means) - Specific risks to each concept 	<p>The seminar articulates the interests that form the foundation for their outline NSS.</p> <p>Integration of at least one IS sub course concept is demonstrated.</p> <p>Using their global strategic estimate, the seminar presents desired global conditions (Ends) for near (0-5 year), medium (5-15 year), and long (15-20 year) time frames.</p> <p>Heading-level detail is provided through concise descriptive headers.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is provided through two non-DoD focused strategic concepts (Ways) that describe activities and methods the U.S. government could employ to achieve NSS objectives. Discussion includes consideration of stakeholders, decision-makers, and processes. Broad detail includes identification and discussion of concept required capabilities (Means).</p> <p>Integration and application of FPA sub course concepts are demonstrated.</p> <p>Timeline (near/med/long) for implementation/execution may be considered.</p>	<p>The seminar presents desired conditions (Ends) but fails to break conditions into near, medium, and long-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 two non-DoD-focused concepts (Ways) that describe activities, but do not provide detail on necessary resources or actors.</p>	<p>The seminar presents desired conditions (Ends) that are well outside the 20-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>



NSDM FX-10

Seminar Presentation Grading



	<p>Integration and application of multiple FPA sub course concepts are demonstrated.</p> <p>Timeline (near/med/long) for implementation/execution is considered.</p>			
Outline National Military Strategy	<p>NMS clearly supports desired global conditions laid out in NSS.</p> <p>Seminar clearly describes how the military instrument of power will be utilized to support U.S. national objectives through heading and sub-heading level detail.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is provided through two DoD-focused joint operating concepts (Ways) that concisely describe activities the U.S. military would employ to achieve NMS objectives.</p> <p>If applicable, Concept Required Capabilities (Means) are identified/discussed and may be conceptualized across DOTMLPF-P.</p> <p>Risks to the proposed military strategy (internal and external) are discussed with mitigation considered.</p>	<p>Seminar clearly describes how the military instrument of power will be utilized to support U.S. national objectives.</p> <p>Nesting of the NMS under the NSS is inferred but not clearly depicted or communicated.</p> <p>Sub-heading level detail is provided through two DoD-focused joint operating concepts (Ways) that concisely describe activities the U.S. military would employ to achieve NMS objectives. Concept Required Capabilities are identified.</p> <p>There is some discussion about risk to the military strategy.</p>	<p>NMS outline does not clearly support NSS objectives.</p> <p>NMS does not provide sufficient sub-heading level detail about DoD-focused operating concepts. Concepts are not joint by design.</p> <p>NMS does not consider risk or realistic limitations imposed by resource-constrained environment.</p>	<p>The seminar fails to present an outline NMS.</p>
Vision of Future Joint Force	<p>Seminar clearly describes their vision of the future Joint Force require to achieve strategic military objectives described in NMS and DoD-focused operating concepts with linkages to their strategic estimate.</p> <p>Broad strategic and operational characteristics of the force are highlighted with emphasis on capacity and capabilities, along with projected required timelines for availability/employment.</p> <p>Tradeoffs, investment, and divestment, and required modernization to achieve required force are considered.</p> <p>Budgetary implications and relevant risks and obstacles to</p>	<p>Seminar describes their vision of the future Joint Force required to achieve strategic military objectives described in NMS and DoD-focused operating concepts.</p> <p>Characteristics of the force are highlighted with emphasis on capacity and capabilities.</p> <p>Tradeoffs to achieve required force are considered.</p> <p>Some risks and obstacles to attaining the required force are identified.</p>	<p>Seminar describes a vision of a future Joint Force required to accomplish military tasking. Linkages to proposed NMS outline are not present.</p> <p>Vision of future force is generic and not tailored to strategic considerations identified in seminar's strategic estimate.</p> <p>Vision of future Joint force does not consider realistic budgetary constraints or the need for tradeoffs. No consideration of risk acceptance and timelines is noted.</p>	<p>Seminar fails to present a vision of a future Joint Force.</p>



NSDM FX-10

Seminar Presentation Grading



	attaining the required force are identified and possible mitigation discussed.			
Implementation Case	<p>Seminar selects a challenging element of their strategic proposal as the focus of their implementation case.</p> <p>Seminar identifies senior leader and key stakeholders involved in their selected element and considers their likely interests and position on the issue.</p> <p>Integration of multiple FPA sub course concepts is demonstrated.</p> <p>Full range of influences and obstacles associated with the implementation of strategic element is considered. Two-level game factors such as political challenges and feasibility are presented and discussed.</p> <p>Realistic options for overcoming obstacles are presented.</p> <p>Plan of action and milestones (POAM) is presented along with risk analysis and mitigation. Points of highest risk are identified.</p>	<p>Seminar selects an acceptable element of their strategic proposal as the focus of their implementation case.</p> <p>Seminar identifies senior leader involved in their selected element.</p> <p>Integration of at least one FPA sub course concepts is demonstrated.</p> <p>Some influences and obstacles associated with the implementation of the strategic element are considered.</p> <p>Some options for overcoming obstacles are presented but are underdeveloped or unrealistic.</p> <p>Plan of action and milestones (POAM) is presented.</p>	<p>Seminar selects an element of their strategic proposal as the focus of their implementation case.</p> <p>Seminar does not identify the senior leader or key stakeholders relevant to their implementation case. Discussion centers on departmental level and does not consider key stakeholders within the department.</p> <p>No FPA sub-course concepts are demonstrated.</p> <p>Very little consideration is given to risk or obstacles to implementation.</p> <p>No plan of action and milestones is presented.</p>	<p>Seminar fails to select one element of their proposal for deeper examination and discussion through their implementation case.</p>
Effective Organization, Timing, and Delivery	<p>Presentation has a clearly identifiable Golden Thread (logical connective theme) that consistently ties all elements together and ensures cohesion between strategic estimate, interests and desired conditions (Ends), strategic outlines and concepts (Ways), future Joint Force (Means), and risk consideration. Helps ensure audience retention and impact.</p> <p>Verbal transitions between elements and speakers are smooth and efficient.</p>	<p>The 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 2 different speakers are utilized.</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 2 different speakers are utilized.</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 46 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 47 minutes to complete.</p>



NSDM FX-10

Seminar Presentation Grading

	<p>A minimum total of 2 different speakers are utilized.</p> <p>Presenters speak clearly with minimal verbal pauses and minimize distracting movement or body language.</p> <p>The brief is completed in no more than 45 minutes.</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 46 minutes.</p>		
Effective Style and Format	<p>Slides are not overcrowded and make use of white space to allow for effective visual communication in concert with spoken narration.</p> <p>Spoken narration leads the way, using slides to emphasize main points through bullet points and graphics.</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>Some slides are overcrowded and would benefit from additional white space.</p> <p>Spoken narration is essentially just a reading of the slides.</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 are overcrowded with either too much text or too many graphics. The audience is unable to listen to spoken narrative while also processing slides.</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>
Question and Answers (30 Minutes)				
Question and Answer Execution	<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 seminar members, either in 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 NSDM 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 NSDM course concepts.</p>

Required Preparation

- Entirety of NSDM curricula.