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INTERNATIONAL SECURITY 1

COURSE OVERVIEW

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The 2017 National Security Strategy depicts a dangerous world, in which peer competitors wielding nuclear weapons have overshadowed two decades of nonconventional conflicts. The distribution of power, once dominated by US unipolarity, has been disturbed by a rising China in the East and a resurgent Russia in the West. How do we make sense of these events and consider new approaches to uncertain challenges? International Security 1 provides a comprehensive overview of the context in which the development of US grand strategy occurs. The course introduces three traditions of International Relations (IR) to provide a foundation for considering the current opportunities and challenges to US policy in the emerging strategic environment. These course concepts are then applied to the 2-Plus-3 (Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and Violent Extremist Organizations), enabling students to develop interpretations and responses to International Security issues systematically.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. Comprehend the three theoretical traditions of IR.
2. Apply these traditions to better understand the opportunities and challenges for the US in the emerging strategic environment.
3. Analyze the major threats facing the US today (2-Plus-3) and identify appropriate strategic responses to those threats.

COURSE QUESTIONS

1. How does each IR tradition conceive international security, and how does each inform international politics and US grand strategy?
2. How do current opportunities and challenges in the international system complicate US strategy and our understanding of international security?
3. What is the nature of each threat emphasized by the National Security Strategy, and how should the US respond?

COURSE ORGANIZATION AND NARRATIVE

International Security 1: The Context of International Security seeks to develop thoughtful, incisive decision makers at the tactical and operational levels of war with the ability to marry these decisions to higher levels of thought through an understanding of the complex relationships between policy, strategy, and the international environment in which they are developed. This course emphasizes comprehension of the emerging strategic environment as a precursor to taking effective action and conducting military operations. The course requires students to think critically about the underlying assumptions that drive US grand strategy in the contemporary environment.
International Security 1 has three phases, intended to engage the student with existing theoretical frameworks, complicating factors, and contemporary threats that drive US grand strategic thinking.

Phase I introduces three traditions of international relations theory to create a foundation for understanding individual and state behavior in the international system. It introduces the concept of grand strategy and explores different grand strategic options for the US in the emerging strategic environment.

Phase II of the course considers the opportunities and challenges for US grand strategy embedded in the current strategic environment. It unpacks the concepts of globalization, nationalism, human security, nuclear proliferation, and cyberspace. In doing so, the phase demonstrates how these forces complicate and influence grand strategic thinking and problem solving in international politics.

Phase III of the course examines the five challenges identified by the 2017 National Security Strategy: Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and violent extremist organizations (2-Plus-3). The phase pulls through the theoretical threads from Phase I and Phase II not only to give the students a better understanding of the nature of these threats, but in order to impress upon the students the importance of thinking systematically about developing US approaches to them.

In each of these phases, International Security 1 employs an approach that requires students to ground theoretical thinking about the world in the current international political context. The course methodology uses the disciplines of philosophy, political science, history, and security studies to lay a theoretical foundation through which to consider international security, and then obliges students to build on that foundation by incorporating contradicting logics, and finally asks students to apply these frameworks by considering strategies to counter threats to US interests in the emerging strategic environment. The course methodology is unique, combining the study of foundational theories of war with application and close analysis of historical and contemporary case studies. Students thus derive lessons, concepts, and ideas as the basis for decision making in strategy, planning, and operations. This methodological approach illustrates how theory influences the formulation of foreign policy and grand strategy, and gives students a better appreciation of how US strategic objectives influence military objectives at the operational and tactical levels of war.

To develop a joint force that is “knowledge empowered, networked, interoperable, expeditionary, adaptable, enduring/persistent, precise, fast, resilient, agile, and lethal,” it is first necessary to develop the leaders with an understanding of the emerging strategic environment. This requires joint officer development approaches that forge joint officers who can think critically and systematically, and who can relate their operations to the strategic context in which they take place. The goal of International Security 1 is to provide such an education through a study of theories of state behavior and US grand strategy in both an historical and a contemporary context.

---

1 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, CJCS Visions for Joint Officer Development (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 2005), p. 2.
International Security 1: The Context of International Security addresses Intermediate-Level College Joint Learning Areas and Objectives for Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) established by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff via the Officer Professional Military Education Policy (OPMEP), CJCSI 1800.01E, signed 29 May 2015. The course supports the following Joint Learning Areas and Objectives, listed below with points of explanation:

**Learning Area 1 – National Military Capabilities Strategy**

a. Comprehend the capabilities and limitations of US military forces to conduct the full range of military operations in pursuit of national interests.
   - Lesson IS1 – 510 addresses the topic of US grand strategy broadly, incorporating military, economic, and diplomatic resources to realize political ends.
   - Lessons IS1 – 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, and 520 present the complicating factors to US foreign policy development in the current international strategic environment.
   - Lessons IS1 – 521, 524, 525, 526, 529, and 530 discuss the current security challenges to US national interests in the form of the 2+3.

b. Comprehend strategic guidance contained in documents such as the National Security Strategy, the Quadrennial Defense Review, National Military Strategy, Global Force Management Implementation Guide (GFMIG), and Guidance for Employment of the Forces.
   - Lessons IS1 – 500 and 501 directly relates the course to the National Security Strategy 2017 (NSS) and the Joint Operating Environment 2035 (JOE 2035).
   - Lessons IS1 – 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, and 510 approach the US strategic environment from a theoretical standpoint, analyzing the assumptions policymakers make about individual and state behavior in the international system, and how this influences foreign policy development.
   - Lessons IS1 – 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, and 530 each possess tie-ins to various strategic documents such as the NSS, NDS, and JOE.

d. Comprehend strategic guidance contained in documents such as the National Security Strategy, the Quadrennial Defense Review, National Military Strategy, Global Force Management Implementation Guide (GFMIG), and Guidance for Employment of the Forces.
   - Lessons IS1 – 500 and 501 directly relates the course to the National Security Strategy 2017 (NSS) and the Joint Operating Environment 2035 (JOE 2035).
   - Lessons IS1 – 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, and 510 approach the US strategic environment from a theoretical standpoint, analyzing the assumptions policymakers make about individual and state behavior in the international system, and how this influences foreign policy development.
   - Lessons IS1 – 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, and 530 each possess tie-ins to various strategic documents such as the NSS, NDS, and JOE.

**Learning Area 3 – Joint and Multinational Forces at the Operational Level of War**

a. Comprehend the security environment within which Joint Forces are created, employed, and sustained in support of JFCs and component commanders.
   - All course lessons seek to convey an understanding of the current security environment in which US grand strategy and foreign policy are developed.

b. Comprehend the relationships between all elements of national power and the importance of comprehensive approaches, the whole of government response, multinational cooperation, and building partnership capacity in support of security interests.
   - All course lessons relate the importance of utilizing diplomatic, informational and economic, as well as the military instrument of national power to support security interests.
Learning Area 4 – Joint Planning and Joint Execution Processes

f. Comprehend the roles that factors such as geopolitics, geo-strategy, society, region, culture/diversity, and religion play in shaping planning and execution of joint force operations across the range of military operations.

- Lessons IS1 - 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, and 509 present various theoretical frameworks for understanding contemporary geopolitics.
- Lessons IS1 – 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, and 520 cover how variations in society, culture, and religion can inhibit US strategic interests across the system.
- Lessons IS1 – 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, and 530 indirectly address regional differentiation in security environments.

Learning Area 6 – Joint Operational Leadership and the Profession of Arms

e. Communicate with clarity and precision.

- Student critical thinking, reasoning, and problem solving is assessed through two essay examinations requiring students to extend and apply concepts provided in class, conducting an analysis of an international historical event, as well as a contemporary US national security threat. These assessments take place between IS1 508 when the midterm is issued, and IS1 529, when the final exam is due.

JPME SPECIAL EMPHASIS AREAS

The CJCS memo, Academic Year 2018-2019 Joint PME Special Areas of Emphasis List (cm-0016-18), dated 25 January 2018, also identifies emphasis areas which are addressed in IS1 as appropriate.

Emphasis Area 2 – Strategic Deterrence in the 21st Century/Deterrence and Escalation Dynamics

a. IS1 510 discusses various aspects and viewpoints on deterrence from a variety of grand strategic perspectives. In addition, 517 and 518 deal with issues of nuclear proliferation and counterproliferation.

Emphasis Area 3 – Non-Traditional Threats to Security and Stability

a. IS1 515 and 516 address human security issues directly tied to this emphasis area, providing a foundational perspective on non-traditional threats to security and stability, and illustrating these issues with a case application.

Emphasis Area 4 – Information as the 7th Joint Function

a. Specific applications of information dissemination and its use in strategy is explored in IS1 530 with respect to Violent Extremist Organizations

Emphasis Area 5 – Need to Enhance Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction

a. IS1 517 and 518 focus on discussion of proliferation and counter-proliferation of WMDs in support of this emphasis area. Additionally, 523 and 524 address potential strategies in dealing with the North Korean nuclear threat.
COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. **READINGS.** Before lecture and seminar, students are expected to complete all assigned readings for the day. Students are encouraged to read the explanation given in the syllabus before reading the assigned books and articles. The syllabus also provides information on current joint doctrine, as it relates to the topic of the day. While students are not required to read joint doctrine for this course, they are encouraged to explore the connections between military theory, operational art and current joint doctrine.

2. **LECTURES.** Students will attend faculty lectures relating to assigned readings and seminar. These presentations compliment the readings and seminar discussion, and therefore enhance knowledge of the course concepts. Lectures in the course take two forms: morning lectures provide historical and theoretical background to stimulate and enhance learning in seminar. Additionally, three lectures on the IR traditions will be provided in the afternoon to set the context for the readings assigned for the following day. These are lectures IS1 503, 505, and 507.

3. **SEMINAR PARTICIPATION.** Student participation in seminar discussions is vital to the success of the course. Students must prepare for each seminar by completing all of the assigned readings. Each member of seminar is expected to contribute to the discussion.

4. **WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS.** There are two written, graded assignments: a three-page take-home midterm examination and a five-page take-home final examination in fulfillment of the requirements of the International Security 1 course.

METHODS OF EVALUATION. There are two written, graded assignments in fulfillment of the requirements of the IS1 course:

1. A three-page take-home examination worth 40% of the final grade
2. A five-page take-home final examination worth 60% of the final grade

COURSE ADMINISTRATION

There are two types of readings in this course: 1) readings from books issued from the ACSC Book Issue Room; and 2) selected chapters and articles posted on the Common Drive (R:) or on Canvas as directed by ACSC Registrar. To avoid confusion, the syllabus denotes all readings posted on the Common Drive or Canvas as “EL” (“electronic”). In addition, lecture slides will be posted on the Common Drive or Canvas every Friday at 1200.

ACSC provides students with copies of the following course books, which must be returned at the conclusion of the course:


Please refer any questions to Dr. Wes Hutto (Course Director, james.hutto.5@us.af.mil, Office 248) or Maj Beau Tresemer (Deputy Course Director, beau.tresemer@us.af.mil, Office 254).
DAY 0 – COURSE INTRODUCTION

DATE: October 5

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Explain the course objectives, course questions, and course narrative.
2. Review the course syllabus and methods of evaluation.
3. Outline expectations for the course.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-500 (L): Course Overview (Dr. Wes Hutto)
Overview: This lecture introduces students to the course objectives, schedule and requirements, as well as the overall narrative and three phases of the course.

CONTACT HOURS: 0.5-hour lecture

IS1-501 (S): Course Introduction
Overview: In this seminar, instructors introduce themselves to their seminars, discuss classroom policies, and set the stage for seminar discussions schedule for Day 1.

CONTACT HOURS: 0.5-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS
1. NSS 2017 [EL]
2. NDS 2018 Summary [EL]
3. JOE 2035 (Joint Operating Environment: The Joint Force in a Contested and Disordered World, July 2016.) [EL]
DAY 1 – INTRODUCTION TO GEOPOLITICS

DATE: October 16

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Identify the definition of theory and consider the utility of theory.
2. Comprehend the differences among the three traditions of International Relations: realism, liberalism, and constructivism.
3. Identify how each tradition uses the individual, state, and system levels of analysis, and other key concepts of International Relations, as well as the limitations of each tradition.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-502 (S): Mapping Global Competition: Three Frameworks and Three Images
Overview: International relations (IR) theory predicts and explains how people, states, and organizations behave in the international environment. Phase I of IS1 examines the key theories, levels of analysis, and foundational concepts of IR; it then reveals how they inform the making of grand strategy. Nye and Welch introduce traditions of realism, liberalism, and constructivism, establishing their utility for understanding international security. They also present the three levels of analysis (images) of IR – individual, state, and international system – which further enhance our comprehension of international security. (Please see Levels of Analysis handout.) Finally, they establish the major concepts of IS1: anarchy, the security dilemma, the shadow of the future, the national interest, interdependence, identities, and norms. While no one tradition, image, or concept can fully predict or explain international security trends, taken together, they can help us to think about these trends more rigorously and systematically. The traditions provide us with a common language for tackling the most challenging questions of the field: Why are some environments characterized by competition while others are not? What causal mechanisms are associated with the outbreak of war? Can we best trace episodes of conflict to the level of the individual, the state, or the international system? Which types of grand strategy are most often associated with tempering, preventing, or causing war?

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

IS1-503 (L): Realism: Dr. Jim Forsyth
Overview: Realism is the oldest of the three paradigms of international relations stretching back to contemporary analyses of the Peloponnesian Wars. At its core, realism argues conflict is endemic among states that exist in an anarchic world where they must fend for themselves. States are the essential actors who seek their “rational” self-interest, particularly their security interests, within the anarchical international environment. Great powers are the most important actors in the system.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture
REQUIRED READINGS

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2017
NDS 2018 (Summary)
DAY 2 – REALISM: THE POWER OF STATES

DATE: October 19

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend defensive realism (Waltz) and power-transition theory (Gilpin).
2. Apply realism in order to better understand the occurrence of war in the international system.
3. Analyze realist predictions concerning the end of the Cold War.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-504 (S): Structural Realism, Great Power Competition, and Great Power War
Overview: The IR tradition of realism develops around a concern about power and material capabilities. The tradition describes the world as a Hobbesian anarchic system of states—according to Waltz (1979), anarchy means “politics in the absence of government.” Interstate relations, according to realism, are based around self-help, and so each state can only expect the other to do what is best for itself. This necessarily limits cooperation between states, as each is required to build capabilities and preserve its independence in order to provide for its own security. In anarchy, the distribution of capabilities defines the structure of the system, whether it be unipolar (one great power), bipolar (two great powers), or multipolar (multiple great powers). Waltz analyzes two forms of state behavior under anarchy, bandwagoning and balancing, and contends that balancing is the dominant behavior in an anarchic system. This is because “Nobody wants anyone else to win; none of the great powers wants one of their number to emerge as the leader” (p. 126). This implies that any unipolar system will be subject to balancing in short order. According to the author, bipolar systems—like the one during the Cold War—are the most stable, as there is more certainty and less military interdependence. As Waltz suggests, “With only two great powers, both can be expected to act to maintain the system” (p. 204).
Gilpin (1988) takes issue with this argument. Instead, the author suggests that bipolar systems are much less stable than hierarchical (or unipolar) systems. Bipolarity, in this sense, results from an undermining of the position of the hegemonic state, leading to hegemonic, or great power war. Gilpin applies his theory of hegemonic stability to the case of the Second Peloponnesian War: “the real cause…The growth of the power of Athens, and the alarm which this inspired in [Sparta], made the war inevitable” (p. 596). Which theory is correct? Are bipolar or unipolar systems more stable? Whichever theory is correct about system stability and war, neither Waltz nor Gilpin anticipated the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. Gilpin’s theory, in particular, implied that the Cold War would—at some point—turn hot. Of course, this was not the case. As a resurgent Russia threatens in the West, and an emerging China rises in the East, we again must ask whether or not these potential changes to the system structure will bring about war, and if so, whether or not we can prevent it.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

IS1-505 (L): Liberalism: Dr. Mary Hampton
Overview: Liberalism, born of the Enlightenment, focuses on the inclination to seek increased prosperity, enhanced individual liberty, and decreased instances of war among competitive states. Liberal institutionalism explains how institutions help promote and expand interstate cooperation. The international system is linked at many levels and in many areas by institutions and organizations. Institutions can be intergovernmental (IGO), non-governmental (NGO), and transnational, or even ad hoc in nature. All states, including the United States, must account for
these institutions and organizations in their conduct of foreign policy. Choosing to ignore, bypass, accommodate, or consult these actors can be a matter of vital importance for the national interest.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

REQUIRED READINGS

   Theory [Key Concept]: Realism assumes that anarchy produces a self-help system in which states build material capabilities to survive. This limits the ability of states to cooperate, and drives great powers to balance against one another. Bipolar systems are stable as there is more certainty in the behavior of the two great powers that are primarily interested in maintaining the system structure (Waltz 1979).


   Extension [Concept Debate]: While anarchy does have the effect of creating a system of self-help, bipolarity results from an undermining of the structure’s hierarchy, and will inevitably lead to great power conflict and war. This is primarily because “there is an incompatibility between crucial elements of the existing international system and the changing distribution of power among states within the system.” Thus, hegemonic (or hierarchical) systems are more stable (Gilpin 1988).

   Application [The Second Peloponnesian War]: The differing ability of Athens and Sparta to adjust to the new economic and technological environment, as well as the changed nature of power, ultimately led to war between the two great powers (Gilpin 1988).

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2017 pp. 1
DAY 3 – LIBERALISM: THE POWER OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER
DATE: October 23

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the various common values shared within liberalism, and the tension in which these values exist.
2. Apply liberalism in order to better understand the prevention of war in the international system.
3. Analyze the end of the Cold War through the lens of liberalism.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-506 (S): American Hegemony, Institutions, and Great Power Competition and Cooperation
Overview: As addressed in Day 1 by Nye and Welch and Snyder, one theory alone cannot explain all aspects of the international system. Just as a topographical map depicts geographic features, and a political map depicts clear delineated boundaries between states, both are maps, attempting to address different segments of reality. Realism’s pessimism toward the relations between states is countered by liberalism. Liberals seek to answer when, how, and why states often cooperate for mutual benefit, both in peace and war. By the end of World War II, the victorious Allies had established a series of interlocking and overlapping transnational arrangements between states, facilitated through agreements and institutions such as the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations, and the International Monetary Fund. The US was placed solidly at the helm of this new system following Dumbarton Oaks and the Bretton Woods Agreement in 1944. This system is thought to embody the “liberal” ideals held by the United States and other Western democracies; individual rights, the importance of the free market and free trade, as well as institutions that foster diplomacy between states. This system is referred to as the liberal world order. Unlike the anarchic system described under realism, liberalism sees anarchy in the world, but also sees opportunities to mitigate that anarchy through institutions, trade, and the interdependence between states that is generated through these arrangements. Deudney and Ikenberry describe a structural liberalism characterized by security institutions, American hegemony, semi-sovereign great powers (Germany and Japan), economic openness, and a particular Western civic identity. The authors present this structural liberalism as a system in and of itself that has direct effects on the behaviors of states both inside and outside of that system. The authors demonstrate these effects in the second article, “The International Sources of Soviet Change,” when they suggest that the benignity and attractiveness of the democratic Western system, in addition to the nuclear age, created a safe space for the Soviet Union to retrench without lashing out in war, and reform to a more open state. Notice the importance of the peaceful end to the Cold War that the Western system allowed, which was thought improbable by many realists prior to the Soviet collapse.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

IS1-507 (L): Constructivism: Dr. Wes Hutto
Overview: This lecture will discuss the role of ideas, identities, and norms, and their significance to International Relations and military practitioners. The lecture begins by introducing constructivism with an exploration of its three philosophical claims: society as a given, objective reality; society as a being created by humans; and society as creating human
interaction. These claims motivate a specific understanding of constructivism in IR, which Dr. Hutto examines through the Three Images of International Relations: the individual, the state, and the system. The culmination of the lecture presents three US foreign policy strategies that are inspired by the constructivist tradition.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

REQUIRED READINGS


   Theory [Key Concept]: Liberalism assumes that while anarchy is always present, its effects can be mitigated through institutional and economic arrangements that produce a condition of interdependence between states. States can collectively mobilize for the greater good, sometimes opting for absolute over relative gains. Liberalism contends that if states are rational security seekers (as Realism suggests), that the constraints of interdependence will provide more stability than self-help.

   Extension [Concept Refinement]: The liberal international order is a Western system in which “like-minded” states cooperate within economic and security institutions for their mutual benefit. It has effects on state behavior within and outside of its purview.


   Application [The End of the Cold War]: The multi-faceted liberal capitalist system of states (liberal international order) presented a relatively benign and magnetic face to the Soviet Union, making the system’s policies attractive, and non-threatening enough to allow Soviet retrenchment to produce policy change.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

NSS 2017 pp. 1-2, 17, 19, 34, 40-42.
NDS 2018 (Summary) pp. 1-2
DAY 4 – CONSTRUCTIVISM: THE POWER OF IDEAS

DATE: October 26

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the components of a constructivist worldview, primarily, the role of identities, norms, and ideas in the international system.
2. Apply constructivism in order to shed new light on concepts developed by the realist and liberal traditions.
3. Analyze the end of the Cold War through the lens of constructivism.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-508 (S): The Inevitability of Great Power Competition? The Three Images of Constructivism, and How the First Caused Soviet Decline

Overview: Realism and Liberalism both tend to agree on the relative importance of the distribution of capabilities, and the constraints and effects that are generated by the anarchic system of states. These two traditions take this distribution as objectively given. Constructivism, on the other hand, does not make this assumption. Constructivism argues that the world can be understood as a distribution of meaning, rather than one of material capabilities. It is thus the meaning that we give certain capabilities in the hands of certain actors that define the relative security of any given relationship. In this way, the constructivist tradition emerges not necessarily as a “tradition,” but rather as critique of the other two traditions. Realism and liberalism both say that anarchy produces insecurity. Constructivism, however, says that “anarchy is what states make of it” (Wendt 1999). That is, international politics are “socially constructed” through the exchange of ideas that form a shared knowledge between states about one another. The character of international life is determined by the beliefs and expectations that states have about how other states will act, what the values of the others are, and how those values inform various national interests. Interestingly, constructivism leaves space for these beliefs and expectations to change. Often this change occurs slowly over time following multiple interactions between actors. Sometimes, these actors are states, and other times they are non-state entities, like individuals or organizations. Thomas (2005) details how ideas about human rights—proliferated throughout the system by Western non-governmental organizations—were instilled in Soviet leadership. Importantly, once the leadership began to recognize norm change and attempt to speak to Soviet dedication to human rights, their citizenry and international reputation depended on Soviet behavior to follow its discourse, leading to the glasnost policy, the perestroika movement, and the eventual peaceful decline of the Soviet Union.

CONTACT HOURS: 3.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

Theory [Key Concept]: For something to be socially constructed means that an object is given particular meaning by way of the social interactions and relationships that take place
around the object. In IR, the ideas that exist among us about the world shape our actions within the world. In turn, these ideas are also shaped by our actions with one another.

**Extension [Concept Refinement]:** Constructivism claims that the anarchic system of states is a social construction, capable of changing shape as relations within anarchy change. New norms or state identities can prompt significant changes in the relations between states, causing new rules of the game (competition, cooperation, conflict) to take hold within the international system.


**Application [The End of the Cold War]:** Western ideas about human rights were disseminated by various means into the Soviet domestic populace and, more importantly, Soviet leadership. Once adopted in discourse, it was only a matter of time before the disconnect between Soviet behavior with its human rights endorsements led to policy action that generated the peaceful dissolution of the Warsaw Pact.

**RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE**
NSS 2017 pp. 1-2, 34, 40-42.

**WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT**
**MIDTERM ISSUED**
LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend how realism, liberalism, and constructivism inform the various grand strategy options for the United States.
2. Comprehend the retrenchment-engagement US foreign policy debate.
3. Identify some of the future options for US grand strategy.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-509 (L): Traditions of US Foreign Policy: Dr. John T. LaSaine
Overview: This lecture will provide students with an historical overview of US foreign policy trends, connecting them to Posen and Ross’ (1996) abstract notions about grand strategy.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-510 (S): The Changing Context and Concepts of Grand Strategy
Overview: The first four days of the course are meant to provide the student with a foundation for the various ways that international politics is viewed and understood by scholars and policymakers. Day 5 provides a transition into Phase II of the course by introducing the concept of grand strategy. There is no real consensus on the meaning of the term, but most agree with B. H. Liddell Hart, who describes, in part, the role of grand strategy as coordinating and directing the resources of a nation toward “the attainment of the political object” (1967, 322). For our purposes, we adopt Posen and Ross’ definition of the term as “relatively discrete and coherent arguments about the US role in the world” (1996, 5). As the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991, the US had known only one grand strategy over the last half-century, depicted by Gaddis (1978) as containment. Posen and Ross (1996) attempt to clarify policy debates surrounding US strategic options following the Cold War, shedding light on four particular grand strategy alternatives. These alternatives all revolve around the “retrench—engage” debate, which addresses the question of whether or not the US should cut (at least some) ties with the international environment, and step out of the “leadership role” it has held since the end of World War II. This debate is brought into the contemporary context by Posen (2015) and Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth (2015). Importantly, each grand strategy under examination—containment, neo-isolationism, selective engagement, cooperative security, primacy, restraint, and deep engagement—is informed by principles introduced in the first four days of the course, and reflects certain characteristics of the world identified by either realism, liberalism, or constructivism. Neo-isolationism, selective engagement, containment, and restraint, are all strategies that reflect realism’s skeptical view of alliance commitments because of the likelihood of free-riding and entrapment, disdain for interventionism, and penchant for balancing and great power politics. Cooperative security and deep engagement are both strategies that reflect liberalism’s confidence in the ability of cooperative institutions and free markets to mitigate conflict and competition in the international environment and enforce respect for Western conceptions of individual rights and liberties. Deep engagement is likely more American-centric, as its focus is on maintaining American preeminence in the post-Cold War international environment. Students will find that constructivist principles run through both cooperative
security and deep engagement, but are perhaps best identifiable in primacy, which—depending on the intentions behind it—is literally “what the US makes of it.”

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS


Theory [Key Concepts]: Grand Strategies are “relatively discrete and coherent arguments about the US role in the world.” There are many types of grand strategy and all are underpinned by principles of realism, liberalism and/or constructivism. The grand strategies addressed in this day are: neo-isolationism, containment, selective engagement, restraint, cooperative security, deep engagement, and primacy.

Extension [Concept Refinement]: The primary divisions between grand strategies consist of whether they involve multilateral or unilateral action, and whether or not they are universalist or particularist in their objectives (Gaddis 1978, p. 26). Additionally, all grand strategies fit onto a spectrum between retrenchment at one end and engagement at the other.

Applications [The Cold War; The Clinton Administration; China’s Rise/America’s Decline]: Gaddis (1978) applies his strategy of containment to the Cold War context. Posen and Ross (1996/7) demonstrate that the Clinton Administration wavered between selective engagement, cooperative security, and primacy. The last two readings, Posen (2015) and Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth (2015), have a debate over whether the US should implement a strategy of restraint or engagement in the face of rising challengers in a period marked by economic decline.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2017
NDS 2018 (Summary)
LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the various dimensions of globalization and their dynamics in the international system.
2. Identify the impact of globalization on security practices.
3. Relate US grand strategy to various dimensions of globalization.

LESSON OVERVIEW
**IS1-511 (L): International Political Economy: Dr. Gabriel Aguilera**

*Overview:* Economic globalization is defined by the increased exposure of domestic markets to the international economy, and is widely seen as a relatively new phenomenon that offers risks as well as opportunities. The notable benefits of open markets are greater access to capital, a vast expansion in trade, massive increases in production, lower prices on consumer goods, and greater pressures for standardized practices of transparency. However, globalization can also result in the straining of social structures, belief systems, and cultures, heightened wealth disparities, and a shift in the relative global balance of state economic and political power. The United States has the world’s largest economy, provides the world’s reserve currency, and has a privileged position in major economic institutions like the IMF and the World Bank. What is the role of the United States in this international economic system? How does American economic policy affect its ability to support the current national security strategy? How fiscally sustainable are U.S. security policies that emphasize a grand strategy of deep engagement? The internal capacity of the U.S. to generate resources for its preferred grand strategy is a crucial component of its ability to pursue that policy. The constraints, however, are political as well as economic.

**IS1-512 (S): Globalization(s) and Implications for International Security**

*Overview:* Phase II of the course introduces students to various factors that complicate US foreign policy and grand strategy. These factors unveil other vital aspects of the international environment. These characteristics must be taken into account when developing strategic approaches to the world. The first, and likely most pervasive of these factors, is globalization. As Reich (1998) notes, and as we explored in Phase I, the end of the Cold War left certain aspects of the international structure unexplained. Since Reich’s writing, many scholars and policymakers have identified globalization as the explanatory force for increased democratization, market deregulation, privatization, welfare reform, non-traditional security agendas, etc. The seeming ubiquity of globalization makes it quite difficult to define. Reich attempts to outline the globalization debate around four definitions: globalization as historical epoch, as the confluence of economic phenomena, as American hegemony, and as a social and technological revolution. Each alternative recognizes the interplay between politics, economics, and culture, while
differing in terms of their definition of what exactly globalization is—contextual era, cause or effect, or a transformative process. Much like the traditions explored in Phase I, then, the perspective of the strategist towards globalization informs the policy options available to “deal with it.” Higgott (2004), for example, defines globalization in primarily economic terms and highlights the securitization of economic globalization by the US in the first years of the 21st century. Economic policy has become an arm of security policy to maintain US dominance in the world. The importance of Reich’s definitions, all connected by the retreat of the state, juxtaposed with Higgott’s reassertion of US sovereignty and security policy reveals a serious tension between globalization and the sovereign state. Indeed, aspects of “deviant globalization” illustrated by the Kilcullen (2013) cases suggest that even the smallest effects of globalization can seriously undermine state security practices. It is thus somewhat understandable that the sovereign state system should reassert itself in certain ways, such as that illustrated by Higgott. We should think about this tension between the process of globalization and the nation-state as we transition to Day 7 – Nationalism.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

Theory [Key Concepts]: Every definition of globalization recognizes the interplay between politics, economics, and culture. Whether globalization is used as a descriptor, causal mechanism, or transformative process, it is related to the increasing proximity and intensity by which international relations take place, as well as the diffusion of power and influence to non-state actors around the world.


Extension [Concept Refinement]: Globalization undermines the norm of sovereignty by increasing the interdependence—both economic and security—between states, increasing the power of markets, and increasing the connectivity of non-state actors. The nature and roles of the state are shifting in the context of globalization and prompt particular actions by states in response.

Application [Economic Securitization; Deviant Globalization]: Higgott (2004) illustrates how globalization has prompted the US to “securitize” economic policies abroad, using economic policy as an arm of influence used to develop a strategy toward potential challengers. Kilcullen (2013) demonstrates how various criminal organizations have been empowered by globalization.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
JOE 2016 pp. 10-14, 30-32
LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the distinction between nationalism as an imagined community and nationalism as a political project.
2. Identify how realism, liberalism, and constructivism inspire various interpretations of nationalism, collective identities, and state sovereignty.
3. Interpret what this means for US grand strategy and the future of international security.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-513 (L): The Influence of Nationalism on Foreign Policy: Dr. Rob Kerr
Overview: The lecture for today will address the construction of nationalism and its role in building (or destroying) the state. Students will gain insight into how nationalism influences the foreign policy programs of states.

IS1-514 (S): Nationalism, State Sovereignty, and Imaginary/Political Projects
Overview: The durability of the sovereign state system in the face of increasing globalization requires some explanation. As discussed by Higgott (2004) in the reading for Day 6, recent increases in nationalism vis-a-vis the sovereign state, is considered a reaction (or backlash) to increasing globalization that undermines the authority of the state. But what is nationalism, how does it work, and what makes it more effective as a tool for mobilizing groups? We might think of nationalism as a dominant form of collective identity that competes with race, ethnicity, and other forms of identity on political landscapes. Anderson (2016) defines nationalism as an imagined, sovereign, community, in which conceptions of nationalism are connected (legitimately or illegitimately) to a larger, more ancient, cultural history. Importantly, Anderson points to the ability for citizens of a particular state to “imagine” themselves as part of a larger group, crediting the Gutenberg press and the rise in rates of literacy for this capacity. Ever since, national memories have been written into our history, as Americans, Britons, French, Indians, Saudis, etc. The national memory of Americans, in particular, is actually quite diverse. Citrin, Haas, Muste and Reingold (1994) outline three American nationalist ideologies: cosmopolitan liberalism, nativism, and multiculturalism. These ideologies map different conceptions of the American national mission or values, each rooted in distinct interpretations of a common history. The authors illustrate a competition between these ideologies for dominance in American politics. Importantly, each ideology also defines the US’ global mission in different terms—that is, they differ in prescribing unilateral vs. multilateral action, they identify US friends and enemies differently, and their respective definitions of the national interest are distinct. The authors provide four types of foreign policy orientations to which each nationalist ideology might ascribe: hardliners, isolationists, internationalists, and accommodationists. Gruffydd-Jones (2017) suggests that those nationalist ideologies that are more prone to “blind patriotism” are likely to gain ground during times of national days, increasing “the public salience of national identity and memories of wars waged to protect that identity, as well as potentially inciting hawkish attitudes” (p. 702). The author finds that conflict is more likely in the thirty to sixty days following national holidays, and uses three cases between Japan and China to illustrate how nationalist pressures during these times have shaped how disputes played out. In sum, collective
identities like nationalism can both pressure political action and be politically manipulated to furthers the national interest. Integrating nationalist sentiments into grand strategy options requires prudence and good judgment. In turn, effectively addressing challenges in the international environment requires one to know which nationalist ideology groups control the foreign policy actions of the adversary.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS


   **Theory [Key Concepts]:** Nationalism is an imagined, sovereign, community that connects its origins to political, cultural, or social memories.


   **Extension [Concept Refinement]:** Nationalism is a social construction. Therefore, different individuals will have different conceptions of what their nationality means. Within the American political sphere, for example, individuals might assign themselves to one of three nationalist ideologies: nativism, cosmopolitan liberalism, multiculturalism. Each of these ideologies is rooted in a particular IR tradition. The nationalist ideologies (inconsistently) reflect four policy orientations: hardliners, isolationists, internationalists, and accommodationists.


   **Application [Nationalism and War]:** Nationalist ideologies that are more prone to “blind patriotism” are likely to gain ground during and around national holidays. This theory is applied to three cases between Japan and China: July 7, the anniversary of the 1937 Japanese invasion of China; August 15, the anniversary of Japan’s 1945 surrender to Allied forces; September 18, the anniversary of the 1931 Japanese invasion of Manchuria. The author finds that nationalist sentiment rises in China following all of these holidays.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

JOE 2016 p. 12-14, 22-23

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT

MIDTERM DUE
DAY 8 – HUMAN SECURITY: A PARADIGM SHIFT?
DATE: November 9

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the various types of human security and their relation to national security.
2. Identify how realism, liberalism, and constructivism inspire various interpretations of human security and its significance for the international system.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-515 (L): The Human Security Paradox: Dr. Ann Mezzell
Overview: Human security is an emerging concept that breaks with traditional understandings of international security. According to the United Nations, conventional perspectives treat the state as the object of security and military aggression as the most concerning threat to that object. The human security perspective, in contrast, treats the individual as the object of security and various interdependent factors – poverty, civil and ethnic conflict, transnational crime, violent extremist activities, pandemics, climate change, and military aggression – as threats to that object. Problematically, conventional perspectives of international security and the new human security concept often conflict. In other words, human security crises are apt to occur in states that are unwilling or unable to provide protections for basic human rights. This raises questions about whether international actors should step in to provide those protections, or whether such interventions constitute violations of the crisis-state’s sovereignty. Regardless of the course of action adopted – intervention or non-intervention – it will pose challenges to the liberal international order. This order rests on pillars of state sovereignty and (arguably) human rights; thus, neither intervention nor non-intervention is an ideal option. Yet, failure to act in some manner is also unacceptable. Inaction generates moral costs; it also affords chances for the human security crisis to evolve into, or further complicate, a conventional security crisis. This paradox is at the heart of contemporary responsibility to protect (R2P) debates.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-516 (S): Human Security and the Syrian Refugee Crisis
Overview: The relative rise in nativist and neo-isolationist discourse in American politics is a fairly recent phenomena. Since the end of the Cold War, rather, the US has more often tailored its military responses to counter nontraditional security issues and the transnational threats shaped by globalization. Reveron and Mahoney-Norris suggest that ensuring national security in a globalized “world…requires new ways of conceptualizing security” (2011, p. 5). Human security is thus depicted as the new dominant paradigm in international politics. To adherents of this new paradigm, human security supplants realism’s view of states as the primary actors in international politics, viewing non-state actors as the new principals. Additionally, the paradigm subsumes aspects of liberalism and constructivism, highlighting the new importance of international institutions (both IGOs and NGOs) in spreading Western norms concerning human rights. Is the practice of human security, however, as simple as this would seem? National interests are frequently wrapped up into various humanitarian efforts, making human security an extension of politics by other means. Berti (2017), is most interested in the provision of aid and relief to those affected by the Syrian refugee crisis as an end in itself—intervening in the areas of...
individual protection, shelter, health and education, and employment. In this regard, the author’s application of human security have particular liberal underpinnings. Berti does, however, appeal to state interests by couching the Syrian refugee crisis in the context regional security and the threat of violent extremist group recruitment. Byman and Speakman (2016) go further in their contextualizing of the crisis in terms of national interest, presenting five potential US options for dealing with the Syrian refugee crisis—turning our backs, massive resettlement, increasing support for regional states, creating a safe zone within Syria, and military intervention—each with its own benefits and costs. Each of these options implies certain understandings of international politics and exist within distinct grand strategy.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

   Theory [Key Concepts]: Human security “is a people centered approach focused on individual human beings and their rights and needs.” It requires a reconceptualization of more traditional definitions of security to include: civic security, economic security, environmental security, maritime security, health security, and cyber security.

   Extension [Concept Refinement]: The Responsibility to Protect doctrine evolved out of particular understandings of human security, and gives states the primary responsibility of protecting their populations against genocide, war, crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. The doctrine goes on the grant the international community the right to provide assistance to states—including direct intervention—that cannot meet these conditions.


   Application [The Syrian Refugee Crisis]: The Syrian refugee crisis is quickly becoming one of the largest human security crises of this era, in terms of civic protection, shelter, health and education, and economic security. The international community has engaged with the crisis to various ends, but with no real effectiveness. Byman and Speakman (2016) outline five options for US involvement in these efforts: open arms, financial aid, safe zone creation, direct military intervention, or closing the Syrian borders.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2018 p. 42
JOE 2016 pp. 36-39
LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the changes that occurred in the politics surrounding nuclear proliferation leading up to and following the end of the Cold War.
2. Identify the different reasons why states proliferate and their connection to the traditions from Phase I.
3. Illustrate how the US can counter different motivations for proliferation.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-517 (L): Nuclear Proliferation—Stability or Instability? Dr. Todd Robinson
Overview: The lecture for today will outline the debate between Kenneth Waltz and Scott Sagan over whether or not nuclear proliferation has a stabilizing effect on international politics. While Waltz maintains that indeed, “more are better,” Sagan argues that organizational flaws within states increase the likelihood of nuclear accidents, creating a destabilized international environment.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-518 (S): Nuclear Proliferation and Counterproliferation
Overview: One might assume that there has been relatively little change in the politics of nuclear weapons since the Cold War, but in fact, there are those that argue convincingly that (beginning as the Cold War was cooling down, in the 1970s) post-Cold War nuclear politics are quite distinct from nuclear politics in a bipolar world. Bracken (2003) demonstrates that in a unipolar or multipolar environment, smaller states are relatively unconstrained by great power balancing, making their proliferation more likely. As a response, the US has increasingly turned away from political and diplomatic responses to proliferation (i.e. arms control regimes), instead focusing on “active” counterproliferation and missile defense. These militarized strategies may be successful in some cases and unsuccessful in others; their success depends on the reasons for proliferation by the small or middle power. In this vein, Sagan (1996) introduces three motivations for state proliferation—security, domestic politics, norms—in order to understand how different determinants require strategic tailoring to meet the particular challenges of each. Note that these determinants align with realist, liberal, and constructivist understandings of state behavior. Again, this signals that strategies underpinned by different traditions will vary in their success depending on whether or not the competitor state views the world similarly. For example, if State A proliferates to seek security, it is likely a US strategy of security assurance might make for successful counterproliferation. If, on the other hand, State A is proliferating for reasons of international prestige, promises of security assurance are unlikely to prevent State A from proliferating. Gavin’s (2015) archival research confirms the flexibility of US policy, what he calls “strategies of inhibition.” The author demonstrates that the US follows three distinct paths depending on the context of the occurrence, legal and normative means, coercive measures, or security assurance methods. Gavin ties these “strategies” to the US grand strategy of deep engagement.
REQUIRED READINGS

1. Paul Bracken, “The Structure of the Second Nuclear Age,” *Orbis* (Summer 2003), pp. 399-413. [EL]
   
   Theory [Key Concepts]: Nuclear proliferation among small and middle states is more likely now than in the past, since states are less constrained by great power balancing as they were during bipolarity.

   
   Extension [Concept Refinement]: There are three main determinants in a state’s decision to proliferate: for security independence, as a result of domestic politics, and for prestige. These determinants align with realist, liberal, and constructivist understandings of state behavior, and will also guide strategists in discerning how best to respond to various proliferating states.

   
   Application [A History of US Counterproliferation Strategies]: We find support for the idea that the strategist adapts counterproliferation policies to the competing reasons for state proliferation. At different points throughout the second half of the 20th century, the US depended on legal and normative means, coercive measures, or security assurance methods to counter nuclear proliferation.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

NSS 2017 pp. 8, 30
NDS 2018 (Summary) pp. 3, 6
LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the debate surrounding US behavior in cyberspace.
2. Apply insights from realism, liberalism, and constructivism that inform this debate.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-519 (M): Zero Days (2016)
Overview: This documentary film tells the story of Stuxnet, a self-replicating computer malware responsible for crashing a key part of an Iranian nuclear facility. The film explores how the dynamics of international politics and national security policy have shifted as a result of new cyber “weapons-systems.” With regard to the seminar readings, students should consider the rise of cyber-norms and what Stuxnet means in the context of these norms. The political message of the film should be clear, the US should be more transparent about its activities in cyberspace. Consider what grand strategy a policy of transparency might fit into, and discuss whether or not this is a viable option for increasing cooperation in cyberspace.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour movie

IS1-520 (S): Cyber Norms or Cyber Hegemony?
Overview: The development of the public-commercial Internet and the expansion of cyber networks over the past three decades has presented many opportunities and challenges for the interaction of states. Forsyth and Pope (2014) argue that cyberspace is simply another domain in which states may compete. According to their argument, great powers will be incentivized to shore up their influence by institutionalizing the cyber domain with rules, norms and standards, thereby constraining competition. This implies that the US should work to establish and maintain organizations that regulate state and non-state conduct in cyberspace, reflecting a grand strategy of cooperative security or deep engagement. Importantly, Forsyth and Pope also assume that the Internet is not capable of withstanding “misbehavior” in cyberspace. Rovner and Moore (2017) question the merits of this assumption. The authors are most interested in testing the resiliency of the internet to withstand offensive cyberoperations (OCO) and cyber espionage that take place during great power competition. The authors find that the internet, as a public good, does not need a hegemon to protect misuse. That is, the trade-off between cyberattacks and espionage and the security of the Internet for the world is not necessarily in effect. The policy implications following from this conclusion, in contrast to Forsyth and Pope, suggest that great power cooperation is not needed to maintain a relatively safe and open internet. As the authors point out, “even when the hegemon is not playing by the rules...The system appears resilient and self-sustaining under stress” (p. 200). Rovner and Moore open up the potential for new US policies in cyberspace, as well as the ability to abandon the cooperative security and deep engagement strategies implicit in Forsyth and Pope’s argument.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour seminar
REQUIRED READINGS


   **Theory [Key Concepts]:** The advent of cyberspace presents new challenges and opportunities for US national security and the strategic landscape. One key question that comes with this new domain is: “what are the rules of the game?” Because of the need to establish rules in cyberspace, great powers will be incentivized to cooperate and institutionalize standards of practice.


   **Extension [Concept Debate]:** Not only is cooperation not inevitable in cyberspace, it is unnecessary. In fact, hegemony is not necessary in cyberspace either. This is because the Internet is resilient in the face of misuse and abuse.

   **Application [Stuxnet; Snowden Revelations]:** In the wake of the Stuxnet and Snowden cases, Rovner and Moore find no evidence that the behavior of users changed online, that firms continued their emphasis on cybersecurity, and that states perceived the events as cautionary tales rather than events that required significant and broad action. In short, the Internet is resilient and not in need of institutional or hegemonic regulation.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

NSS 2017 pp. 12-13, 31
NDS 2018 (Summary) pp. 3, 6
JOE 2016 pp. 33-36

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT

FINAL ISSUED
DAY 11 – IRAN’S QUEST FOR REGIONAL HEGEMONY

DATE: November 27

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the historical context in which interactions between the US and Iran take place.
2. Infer principles of realism and liberalism that inform Iranian behavior.
3. Interpret options for US foreign policy in approaching an emerging Iran in the Middle East.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-521 (S): Sticks or Carrots for Iran?
Overview: Phase III of the course asks students to apply elements of Phases I and II to the most pressing security issues facing the United States today. Broadly stated, the objective for the student on these days is to use the foundations of the course—the traditions—to interpret the 2+3 as it is addressed in the National Security Strategy (China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and Violent Extremist Organizations). Students should then consider the various grand strategies and policy programs addressed in Phase I and II in order to develop the most appropriate strategy to address the issue—always keeping in mind how the complicating factors of Phase II shape state relationships in the international environment. Day 11 is concerned with the increasing relative power of Iran in the Middle East. Historically, its geographic positioning made it a strategic asset in two great power competitions, one between Britain and Russia, the other between the United States and the Soviet Union. Its incredible supply of oil and gas brought rapid industrialization due to the involvement of the Anglo-Arab Oil Company. Its relative wealth as a result, in addition to the size of its population, give it a significant latent power advantage in the region. Between 1979 and 2003, Iran had a regional balancer in the form of Iraq, but the 2003 invasion and subsequent events created significant opportunities for Iran to take a more active leadership role in regional security maintenance. This, of course, has understandably irked other states in the region, as Iran is often, due to the 1979 revolution, perceived as a “revolution exporter.” Barzegar and Dvisallar (2017) argue that this perception is inaccurate. Instead, the authors contend that Iran is a transitional society whose actions and policies can be understood according to rational interests, not ideological motivations. The authors support this using evidence of Iran transforming into a responsible power in contributing to the fight against ISIS, exercising strategic patience with an antagonistic Saudi Arabia, engaging in low-cost security provision by creating networks of foreign fighters and irregulars in Syria, and implementing an increasingly defensive strategy based on blockades and limiting adversaries’ choices. Nasr (2018) adopts the assumption that Iran is a rational rising power, but places emphasis on Iranian revisionism of the regional order. Nasr argues that while the Trump Administration has backtracked on many Obama era policies, it cannot ever fully return to a true containment policy with Iran. Instead, Nasr suggests that the US should continue to engage diplomatically with the region, including Iran in the larger conversation. Cohen, Edelman, and Takeyh (2016) fundamentally disagree with the assumption that Barzegar and Dvisallar and Nasr make, arguing that Iran is in fact, a
revolutionary regime bent on developing nuclear weapons and wielding a hegemonic iron fist in the Middle East. The authors adopt an aggressive strategy to deal with Iran’s pursuit of national interests, focused on rolling back its growing influence and undermining the foundations of its power. Notice that the positions taken by the authors are entirely dependent on their interpretation of Iranian intentions and capabilities. These interpretations are informed by principles of realism, liberalism, and constructivism, and in turn impact the approaches recommended by the authors.

CONTACT HOURS: 3.0-hour seminar

REQUISITED READINGS

Understanding the Threat


Theory [Key Concept]: Is Iran a “revolutionary state” or a rational actor? Barzegar and Divsallar argue that Iran is a transitional society, whose actions and policies can be understood according to rational interests.

Debating Strategic Responses


Extension [Concept Refinement]: Nasr treats Iran as a rational actor, but places emphasis on Iran as a revisionist state, seeking to overturn the Middle Eastern order. Cohen et al. on the other hand treat Iran as a revolutionary state driven not by pragmatic national interest, but instead according to Islamic ideology.

Application [A Strategy for Iran]: Nasr’s treatment of Iran prompts the author to promote a strategy of cooperative security toward Iran, including it as a security provider for the Middle East. Cohen et al.’s assumption about the nature of the Iranian regime leads the authors to take a more hardline bent, arguing that the US should seek primacy over Iran, rolling back Iranian power and influence through economic sanctions as well as military power.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

NSS 2017 pp. 48-50
NDS 2018 (Summary) pp. 2
LESSON OBJECTIVES

1. Comprehend the historical context within which interactions between the US and North Korea take place.
2. Comprehend various arguments for why emerging states might rationally seek to acquire nuclear weapons, and what strategies they might employ to make use of them.
3. Interpret aspects of realism and liberalism that inform a US strategy towards Iran.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-522 (S): North Korea – Rogue Nuclear State?

Overview: The category of “rogue state” has in the past been used to characterize both Iran and North Korea in a single breath. This, however, ignores many nuances between the two states, including their particular views of the world and their distinct behavior in it. Narang (2015) analyzes the internal and regional security dynamics facing Iran and North Korea and shows how each are inclined to develop different nuclear postures in response—Iran an assured retaliation posture for deterrence purposes, and North Korea a catalytic posture using China as a third-party security guarantor. While the author is primarily concerned with the military strategies of these states, these conclusions have varying implications for US grand strategy. As an example, if North Korea, as Narang argues, becomes more belligerent as its third party security guarantees fade, the US should refrain from seeking to undermine the China-North Korean alliance. China has, on multiple occasions actually encouraged the US to seek bilateral negotiations with North Korea. In light of recent discussion by the Trump Administration to take this advice and meet directly with the Kim regime, Pollack (2003) provides an account of the beginnings and ends of the 1994 Agreed Framework between the United States and North Korea. This accord froze the North’s plutonium reprocessing activities in exchange for security guarantees and energy provision from Washington. The author argues that the deal unraveled as both sides left certain obligations unfulfilled and “neither government saw compelling reasons to sustain [it].” Since the end of the Agreed Framework, North Korea has developed its nuclear weapons development program, culminating in the 2017 test launching of multiple ICBMs capable of carrying nuclear warheads. How should the US respond to this issue? Anderson (2017) suggests the response must be tailored to the root of the threat. Using structural realism, the author argues that the primary problem of North Korea is rooted in the power of the United States and its geopolitical position on the Korean peninsula. He suggests that as long as the United States maintains a physical presence in South Korea, North Korea will see ample reason to maintain its nuclear weapons program. Anderson promotes a US negotiation posture without a demand for North Korea to engage in complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization (CVID). In contrast, Moore (2008) emphasizes the continuance of a US policy of denuclearization toward North Korea as a long term goal, and recommends an engagement strategy to that end. The author provides the US with two policy options: institutionalizing the six party talks as a regional security framework to address not only the North Korea problem, but tensions throughout Northeast Asia; offering North Korea full diplomatic recognition by opening an embassy in Pyongyang and eventually opening a North Korean embassy in Washington. Moore argues that
these measures will build trust and confidence between the US and North Korea, and lead to further diplomatic dealings and cooperation in the future.

CONTACT HOURS: 3.0-hour lecture

REQUIRED READINGS

Understanding the Threat


Theory [Key Concepts]: Iran and North Korea differ in their policy goals, influencing the nuclear postures that they adopt in practice. Therefore, the states must be strategically dealt with as individual actors with varied intentions. One key difference between them is that North Korea failed to uphold its obligations not to pursue nuclear weapons under the 1994 Agreed Framework, while Iran continues to meet its obligations as dictated by the JCPOA.

Debating Strategic Responses


Extension [Concept Refinement]: Anderson suggests that North Korea’s interminable pursuit of a preponderant nuclear arsenal is best explained by structural realism. That is, the power of the US and its position on the peninsula is an ever-present threat to the North Korean regime, and as long as the status quo is maintained, North Korea will seek a nuclear capability.


Application [A Strategy for North Korea]: As a result of his theory, Anderson suggests that the US negotiate with North Korea and drop its demand for complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization (CVID). In contrast, Moore (2008) emphasizes the continuance of a US policy of denuclearization toward North Korea as a long term goal, and recommends an engagement strategy to that end. The author provides the US with two policy options: institutionalizing the six party talks as a regional security framework to address not only the North Korea problem, but tensions throughout Northeast Asia;
offering North Korea full diplomatic recognition by opening an embassy in Pyongyang and eventually opening a North Korean embassy in Washington.

**RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE**
NSS 2017 pp. 3, 7, 8, 25-26, 45-28
NDS 2018 (Summary) pp. 2, 3
DAY 13 – RUSSIA’S RESURGENCE AS A GREAT POWER

DATE: December 4

LESSON OBJECTIVES

1. Comprehend the debate surrounding NATO expansion and increasing Russian aggression.
2. Apply insights from realism and constructivism to understand Russian foreign policy decisions.
3. Assess options for US foreign policy in approaching a resurgent Russia; note the complications of alliance building with Russian opponent state and non-state actors.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-523 (L): Understanding Russia and its Leaders: Dr. Dan Connelly
Overview: This lecture will provide an overview of the Russian national ethos, and examine it in the current context of Russian political activity in its sphere of influence, the former Soviet Union.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-524 (S): Russia Resurgent: Causes, Effects, and US Policy Responses
Overview: The end of the Cold War was marked by a Russian strategy of retrenchment. The Warsaw Pact dissolved and was replaced by a looser confederation, subject to less Russian influence, the Commonwealth of Independent States; the Lisbon Protocol ensured that all former Soviet states would disarm themselves of their nuclear weapons; the Soviet economic system was rapidly replaced using “shock therapy,” a rapid form of economic liberalization; and significant cuts were made to the Russian military and defense industry. This strategy brought much liberal optimism in the West about increased cooperation and interdependence with Russia. These hopes unraveled, however, as NATO expansion into the Baltics and elsewhere, along with its intervention and occupation of Kosovo, disrupted relations between Russia and the West. The Russian intervention in Georgia in 2008, and the 2014 Ukraine crisis brought these existing tensions to a head. While many in the US viewed Russia as the aggressor in both situations, many see the US decision in the 1990s to expand NATO as the origin of the problem. Mearsheimer (2014), for example, argues that Russian resurgence is largely a defensive strategy to protect its sphere of influence against US and Western encroachment. Since Mearsheimer identifies the problem as one created by the West, it can be solved relatively simply—by ceasing further NATO enlargement into Ukraine or Georgia. Ziegler (2012), however, sees the problem as much more embedded into Western and Russian identities and norms. The author argues that while Western conceptions of the sovereign state system have shifted—due to forces of globalization and the liberalization that comes from them—Russia, a state historically unfamiliar with liberal norms and values, continues to view sovereignty as absolute and inviolable. This history and perspective often puts Russia at odds with the West, in terms of human security, Western notions of human rights, and the R2P Doctrine. Ziegler concurs with Mearsheimer’s argument about NATO expansion, but suggests that it is reasons of nationalist identity, combined with NATO action, that make the West a “useful” as the international “Other.” Krickovic (2016) explores past attempts at Western-Russian “binding” through institutional arrangements—NATO in particular. The author argues that these attempts at binding have failed because of US and Russian concerns with relative over absolute gains: the NATO-Russia Council, on one hand, created to provide Russia with a seat at the table while maintaining US control over NATO;
Russia, on the other, only interested in NATO involvement in order to constrain the alliance’s actions. Krickovic recommends less formal binding arrangements as a means of building higher levels of trust between Russia and NATO, with each required to make limited concessions through various confidence building measures. Another policy option for the US, of course, is to continue the strategy of the past two and a half decades, NATO enlargement and the “Westernization” of Eastern Europe. Driscoll and Maliniak (2016) argue that this strategy entices factions within smaller states to forge “chain-ganging” strategies. This strategy aims at extracting concessions from an enemy by pulling the security guarantor (in this case, the US and NATO) into a conflict with that enemy. The US can be subject to this strategy in three ways: through alliance management, in which the US has committed to defending the smaller state that has then provoked its own attack; issue slippage, in which the US gets involved in a conflict for one reason, stays involved for another, and so on; and ideational affiliation, in which the US shares an identity, memory, values, norms, etc. with the smaller state and thus behaves in a non-rational fashion to defend that state. Driscoll and Maliniak recommend, like Mearsheimer, limited involvement in areas in which chain-ganging is likely to occur (i.e. Georgia and Ukraine). Importantly, all authors for this day point to more limited engagement in Eastern Europe, recommending various forms of restraint.

**CONTACT HOURS:** 2.0-hour seminar

**REQUIRED READINGS**

**Understanding the Threat**


   **Theory [Key Concepts]:** Mearsheimer, argues, according to realist principles, that the Russian aggression in Ukraine was in response to creep NATO expansionism in its historic sphere of influence. Ziegler, on the other hand, suggests that Russian behavior is driven by traditional understandings of state sovereignty, in contrast to Western conceptions that have shifted due to economic globalization and the proliferation of liberal human security norms.

**Debating Strategic Responses**


   **Extension [Concept Refinement]:** Lending credence to Mearsheimer’s argument, Krickovic demonstrates that whether states are more concerned with relative or absolute gains depends on the context of the particular cooperative action. This implies that the strength of liberalism
or realism in explaining outcomes will vary depending on the context of the interstate relationship.

**Application [A Strategy for Russia]:** Krickovic examines the limits of strategies rooted in liberalism, specifically institutional binding, when dealing with Russia. He argues that basic levels of trust between NATO and Russia must be established before institutional binding can take place. This requires a more selective form of engagement that includes less formal arrangements and confidence building measures. Driscoll and Maliniak examine another potential problem in Russian-NATO relations, the likelihood of smaller dissatisfied states using NATO or US commitments to gain concessions from Russia by drawing the two sides into a conflict with one another. The authors examine the 2008 Georgia War as an example of this. Their argument implies the adoption of a selective engagement strategy in Central Eurasia.

**RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE**
NSS 2017 pp. 2, 8, 14, 25-28, 35, 38, 45, 47-48, 51
NDS 2018 (Summary) pp. 2, 4, 9
LESSON OBJECTIVES

1. Comprehend the national and international context in which China’s rise is taking place.
2. Apply insights from realism, liberalism, and constructivism that inform the US interpretation of the Chinese threat.
3. Assess options for US foreign policy in approaching China’s emergence as a competitor.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-525 (L): China’s Rise – A Geopolitical Reality: Dr. Michael Kraig

Overview: To truly understand modern China one must go beyond simplistic buzz words and black and white categorizations such as "Confucian," "Communist," "Authoritarian," or in terms of foreign policy, "Expansionist," "Defensive," or "Hegemonic." Indeed both the Washington, DC, and global scholarly communities alike remain deeply divided over the following core questions: Is China today weak or strong? Internally durable based on Party legitimacy, or chronically divided and fragile due to chronic corruption and contested ethnic identities? Expansionistic territorially and politically, or mainly focused on reunification of lost territories and sovereign defense of a perceived-besieged homeland? Chronically in debt and ready to economically implode - or set on the next stage of regional economic dominance? And does China have true citizenship and "civic" or "civil" society based on Rule of Law - or does it lack firm cultural and political connectors from individuals to the Party-State?

To make sense of it all, this lecture surveys the tumultuous periods of 1840-1945 and 1978 to the present, taking as a lodestar two distinct yet related symbols and concepts from China's spiritual, moral, and political past: the Yin-Yang duality of the Tao, and the Communist focus on the "dialectic," or Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis. The ultimate answer, as these signifiers hint, is "all of the above." Despite immense wealth, China continues to harbor enduring elements of both durability and fragility, unity and division, strength and insecurity -- always with the possibility of major social and political revolutions lurking in the corner. How elites have reacted to these dualities in constructing "the modern Chinese Nation" in successive periods shows remarkable continuities that have real bearing on China's foreign and security policies. Namely, within and across historical periods of revolution, conflict, and war since 1840 -- involving the deaths of at least 100 million people -- the "answer" to severe socio-economic dilemmas, moral decay, and external threats has always been the same: State Patriotism based on some form of Populist Authoritarianism. The latter have always expressly combined political rule, economic management and decision-making, and a highly moralistic (but secular) notion of the "good citizen" in order to maintain stability domestically while fending off cultural subversion and material predations by untrustworthy foreign powers.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-526 (S): China’s Ascent and US Foreign Policy
Overview: In addition to a resurgent Russia in the West, the rise of China in the East presents further complications of US foreign policy in the 21st century. Haddick (2014) outlines the context in which this emergence to great power status has occurred, politically, economically, and militarily. The author suggests, according to principles of the realist tradition, that China’s growth is attended by increasing interests in East Asia and around the globe. He identifies three interpretations of Chinese intentions and concludes that domestic pressures (nationalism, economic needs, etc.) will couple with international pressures for the power to grow more assertive regarding its security concerns. Onto this, Haddick maps four potential futures for the East Asian region—as identified by the Global Trends 2030 report: an extension of the present order; a Hobbesian/competitive order; a security community; and a hierarchical order led by China. Yu (2014) explores the rising trend of nationalism in China as a driver of increasing assertiveness. The author argues that the rise of populist nationalism in the historical memory of the populace has forced China’s leadership to adopt a more revisionist posture toward the international order. In light of these realities, what is to be done? Recently, many scholars and policy analysts have called for retrenchment in the form of an offshore balancing strategy. Haddick pushes back against this option, instead favoring continued forward presence of US forces in East Asia in order to “persuade” China to accept the status quo. Friedberg (2015) extends the conversation by outlining, in addition to offshore balancing, five other strategic options for the US in dealing with China’s emerging power: enhanced engagement, reassurance, grand bargain/spheres of influence, better balancing, and containment. The author then argues in favor of a better balancing strategy, in which the US would continue to engage diplomatically, economically, and politically with China, while continuing to balance against China by lifting up regional allies and partners to place constraints on China. One policy option addressed within this strategy is the establishment of regional free trade agreements to selectively “deepen globalization” within US partnerships. Green and Goodman (2016) present a case recounting such balancing by the US, detailing the political implications of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP). While the Trump Administration pulled out of the TPP in early 2017, there have recently been reports that it is considering re-entering the trade deal. Regardless of the outcome of these discussions, the TPP presents an excellent illustration of how the US might use economic measures for geopolitical purposes.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour Seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

Understanding the Threat


   Theory [Key Concepts]: The rise of China in East Asia could bring about four potential futures: an extension of the present order; a Hobbesian/competitive order; a security community; and a hierarchical order led by China.


   Extension [Concept Refinement]: The future outcome depends on many factors, one of which is domestic trends within China. It is likely as a result of rising populist nationalism in
China, according to Yu, that China’s leadership will be forced to adopt a more revisionist posture toward the international order.

Debating Strategic Responses


Application [A Strategy for China]: Friedberg outlines six strategic options for the US in dealing with the rise of China: offshore balancing, enhanced engagement, reassurance, grand bargain/spheres of influence, better balancing, and containment. He endorses a better balancing strategy, engaging China diplomatically, economically, and politically while continuing to balance against China by lifting up regional allies and partners to place constraints on China. One policy option addressed within this strategy is the establishment of regional free trade agreements to selectively “deepen globalization” within US partnerships. Green and Goodman (2016) present a case recounting such balancing by the US, detailing the political implications of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP).

**RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE**

NDS 2018 (Summary) pp. 2, 4
DAY 15 – VIOLENT EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS: THE NON-STATE THREAT

DATE: December 14

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the varying political, social, cultural, and historical contexts in which VEOs emerge.
2. Apply insights from realism, liberalism, and constructivism to assess the severity of the VEO threat to US national security.
3. Assess options for US grand strategy in eradicating “Al Qaeda and its affiliates.”

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-527 (L): Addressing VEOs: Dr. Jacqueline L. Hazelton, US Naval War College
Overview: This lecture will connect grand strategy options to US counterterrorism practices. In doing so, the lecture discusses the importance of adopting military strategies that achieve the political goals of grand strategy. It looks toward International Security II, introducing the concept of military strategy and its role in implementing grand strategy through the military arm.

IS1-528 (S): Violent Extremist Organizations—Retrenchment or Engagement?
Overview: For the better part of two decades, the United States has been primarily focused on the counterterror/counterinsurgency fight. These conflicts generally involve the United States military forces on one side, and non-state actors on the other. While the recent National Security Strategy places more emphasis on great power politics and competition, a significant amount of US military action in the world takes place to counter violent extremist organizations—in Afghanistan, Iraq, and across North Africa. What is different about state and non-state interactions, and does it require that we think differently about strategy? To answer this question requires us to step away from grand strategy to set the context of these interactions. Adler (2010) presents what he refers to as “the double-damned dilemma,” a situation in which a state is faced with the choice of reacting with force, or not, to a provocation meant to elicit a response. While not responding to an attack may appear as weakness, responding is exactly what the provocateur wants to enhance their social power and appear as victims. In this trap, not responding is no better than responding. Adler proposes to deal with this problem by instituting a “defusing strategy,” increasing the resilience of domestic infrastructure, as well as audiences to VEO attacks, while avoiding civilian casualties and challenging the narratives produced by the VEO. Adler also proposes a strategy rooted in social constructivism, suggesting that states can change the rules of the game by breaking with established beliefs and institutions. Braddock and Horgan (2016) take the defusing strategy seriously, and examine how a counternarrative operation might be conducted. The authors provide specific guidelines for analyzing and undermining the narratives put forward for the purposes of VEO recruitment and garnering public sympathy. Braddock and Horgan apply their guidelines to a recruitment narrative used by ISIS, demonstrating the counternarrative process in action. Kurth Cronin (2012) departs from the previous readings, depicting a US grand strategy for counterterrorism rooted in realist principles. She recommends that the US implement a grand strategy with five features: protecting the homeland and building domestic resilience; focusing on economic prosperity; strengthening the rules-based order; handing over regional responsibilities to regional powers; acting towards the world according to a principle of self-determination.

REQUIRED READINGS
Understanding the Threat


Theory [Key Concepts]: Adler situates the context of asymmetric conflict in the post-Cold War environment, illustrating the “double-damned dilemma,” a situation in which a state is faced with the choice of reacting with force, or not, to a provocation meant to elicit a response. While not responding to an attack may appear as weakness, responding is exactly what the provocateur wants to enhance their social power and appear as victims. In this trap, not responding is no better than responding. The author suggests that an indirect form of conflict might be necessary in countering these challenges.

Debating Strategic Responses


Extension [Concept Refinement]: Braddock and Horgan extend Adler’s theory by outlining a method by which counternarratives might be disseminated to undermine the performance power of violent extremist organizations. The authors provide specific guidelines for analyzing and undermining the narratives put forward for the purposes of VEO recruitment and garnering public sympathy.

Application [A Strategy for Counterterrorism]: Braddock and Horgan apply their guidelines to a recruitment narrative used by ISIS, demonstrating the counternarrative process in action. Kurth Cronin leaves room for this type of action, but stresses a grand strategy of retrenchment, demonstrating how it would affect the US fight against Al Qaeda.

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

NSS 2017 pp. i, 3-4, 7-12, 42, 45
NDS 2018 (Summary) p. 3
JOE 2016 pp. 22-23

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT

FINAL DUE