

**SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
ARLINGTON, VA**

NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION-MAKING

(PUBP 755-001)

3 Credits

DRAFT

Contact Information:

Christopher A. Corpora, Ph.D.
Adjunct Professor
Phone: (540) 834-3561
E-mail: ccorpora@gmu.edu
Cacorpora@comcast.net

****** Anything discussed or presented in this course is solely the perspective of the instructor and does not reflect the official positions of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or the U.S. Government******

Spring Semester, 2009:

Course Day/Hours/Locations: Tuesdays, 7:20 – 10:00 PM, GMU Arlington Campus (ARL), Room 332.

Office Hours: By appointment, before and after class.

Course Overview

INTRODUCTION

National security policies are informed by a wide range of actors, each of whom makes decisions based on a variety of factors. The way national security policy is decided flows from international, domestic, institutional and inter-personal considerations. In many cases, each of these spheres influences key decision makers. How these individuals, institutions and states come to form decisions allows the student of national security to better understand the relationship between ideas, perceptions, attitudes, words and actions – all playing important roles in the processes of decision. The national security decision maker exists and operates in all states across the globe, and the evaluative processes they employ effect the way nations interact – for better and worse.

This course will review the main attributes and influences that inform national security decision-making – behavioral, economic, strategic, institutional and others – mapping this often complex set of processes. We will explore the tensions found between these orientations and examine how to identify and explain them through a mix of national security case studies and methodological studies from and around the fields of political psychology and organizational theory. The case studies used in this course will span from well-documented historical events through current and developing national security issues. The goals of the course are as follows:

- Develop a nuanced appreciation for the variety of factors that influence national security decision making
- Assess and apply decision making knowledge to evaluation of historic and current national security policy debates
- Recognize how these decision making processes effect policy formations
- Identify key aspects of national security decision making that need to be addressed to manage future policy formation

TEACHING APPROACH:

This seminar will have a mixture of lectures, facilitated discussion and case study practicals. Students will participate in and, at times, be called on to lead a structured, critical dialog about the readings and related world events. Students are expected to prepare informed assessments of the readings and articulate key questions that come from the readings – which are meant to be cumulative and, in some cases, presenting opposing views and approaches to the topic. The seminar will follow a modified Socratic approach, where most of the discussion will be based on addressing a series of questions in reference to the readings and the course topic. Some students prefer lecture-based instruction. However, this interactive approach is a useful and sometimes refreshing way to learn and can yield great results if all engage fully and respectfully with an open mind and an eagerness to learn.

STATEMENT ON SPECIAL NEEDS OF STUDENTS (aka: reasonable standard accommodation language):

If you are a student with a disability and you need academic accommodations, please see me and contact the Disability Resource Center (DRC) at 993-2474. All academic accommodations must be arranged through the DRC.

ONLINE STUDENT JOURNAL:

New Voices in Public Policy: I will consider nominating the very best papers in this course for publication in New Voices in Public Policy. New Voices is a student- and faculty-reviewed journal that shares SPP's finest student work with the rest of the world.

SPP POLICY ON PLAGARISM:

The profession of scholarship and the intellectual life of a university as well as the field of public policy inquiry depend fundamentally on a foundation of trust. Thus any act of plagiarism strikes at the heart of the meaning of the university and the purpose of the School of Public Policy. It constitutes a serious breach of professional ethics and it is unacceptable.

Plagiarism is the use of another's words or ideas presented as one's own. It includes, among other things, the use of specific words, ideas, or frameworks that are the product of another's work. Honesty and thoroughness in citing sources is essential to professional accountability and personal responsibility. Appropriate citation is necessary so that arguments, evidence, and claims can be critically examined.

Plagiarism is wrong because of the injustice it does to the person whose ideas are stolen. But it

is also wrong because it constitutes lying to one's professional colleagues. From a prudential perspective, it is shortsighted and self-defeating, and it can ruin a professional career.

The faculty of the School of Public Policy takes plagiarism seriously and has adopted a zero tolerance policy. Any plagiarized assignment will receive an automatic grade of "F." This may lead to failure for the course, resulting in dismissal from the University. This dismissal will be noted on the student's transcript. For foreign students who are on a university-sponsored visa (e.g. F-1, J-1 or J-2), dismissal also results in the revocation of their visa.

To help enforce the SPP policy on plagiarism, all written work submitted in partial fulfillment of course or degree requirements must be available in electronic form so that it can be compared with electronic databases, as well as submitted to commercial services to which the School subscribes. Faculty may at any time submit student's work without prior permission from the student. Individual instructors may require that written work be submitted in electronic as well as printed form. The SPP policy on plagiarism is supplementary to the George Mason University Honor Code; it is not intended to replace it or substitute for it.

PREREQUISITES:

None

GRADED WORK:

- Take Home Midterm -- 30%: Each student will prepare a 6-8 page paper demonstrating a clear understanding of concepts related to national security decision making – based on the readings and class discussions up through the first half of the class. Students will write two short essays, responding to one mandatory question and choosing the second from a list of questions provided the week before midterms. Each essay will be 3-4 pages in length. This paper is due at the midterm week class noted below.
- Final Paper – 30%: Each student will prepare a 10-12 page paper -- surveying a recent (post-9/11) national security policy (not limited to a U.S. policy) and identifying the various decision making approaches used in debating and forming the final decision. This paper will be an opportunity to apply, cumulatively, the concepts and cases reviewed during the course. This paper will be due on the date of the formally scheduled final exam.
- Team Case Study Presentation – 20%: Students will be teamed in small groups to prepare an overview of an assigned national security decision for a 15-20 minute presentation. The presentations must demonstrate full participation by each member and be presented using PowerPoint or a similar presentation tool. Each team will be provided initial materials on their assigned topic to aid in developing the presentation. However, the teams will be required to find additional materials to develop their cases and provide potential alternative decisions and policies. These presentations will be given in the last few weeks of the term.
- Participation – 20%: Please engage! We all learn best through discussion, debate, and exchange of ideas. Each student will be required to facilitate a part of a seminar during the term – bringing several cogent and critical thoughts together with a small group of classmates. Each student group will be assigned one set of readings or case studies to review and facilitate discussions each week on our class BLOG and during the session. Two or more unexcused absences will result in a full letter grade reduction.

All papers will be double spaced, 1 inch margin, 12pt Times New Roman Font with footnotes – NOT ENDNOTES. A full bibliography is expected for the final paper. All due dates are final with extensions only for those who have written, university approved reasons for delay. Each paper will be marked down a full letter grade for each day it is late. All papers should be sent via email, with return receipt required, and hard-copy in class. This hard and soft copy policy will ensure I receive all papers on time, in case of a need to miss class.

REQUIRED READINGS:

1. **Case Studies in Policy Making, 11th Edition (HK)**, Hayat Alvi-Aziz and Stephen F. Knott, eds., <http://www.nwc.navy.mil/Academics/courses/nsdm/documents/PolicyMaking-11thEd08.pdf> , Newport, Rhode Island: Naval War College, 2008.
2. **Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (AZ)**, Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, New York: Addison, Wesley and Longman Press, 1999.
3. **Global Security Governance: Competing Perceptions of Security in the 21st Century (EJK)**, Emil J. Kirchner and James Sperling, ed., London: Taylor and Francis, 2007.
4. **Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making (DS)**, Deborah Stone, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001.
5. **State of Denial: Bush at War, Part 3 (BW)**, Bob Woodward, New York: Simon and Schuster Adult Press, 2006.
6. **Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers (NM)**, Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, New York: Simon and Schuster Adult Press, 1988.

Also required are various articles and official documents, detailed in the course plan below.

RECOMMENDED READINGS:

1. **Statecraft and Security: The Cold War and Beyond**, Ken Booth, ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
2. **Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology**, David O. Sears, Leoni Huddy, and Robert Jervis, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
3. **System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life**, Robert Jervis, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
4. **At the Center of the Storm: My Years at the CIA**, George Tenet with Bill Harlow, New York: Harper Collins, 2007.
5. **The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics**, Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
6. **U.S. National Security: Policymakers, Processes, and Politics (3rd Edition)**, Sam C. Sarkesian, John Allen Williams and Stephen J. Cimbala, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Press, 2002

Course Plan

Class 1: Sept 1 – National Security Policy Basics

Readings:

1. DS: Part 1

2. Gerras, Stephan J., "Thinking critically about critical thinking: a fundamental guide for strategic leaders, US Army War College, 2006.
3. The US National Security Strategy, March 2006, <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2006/print/index.html>
4. Doyle, Richard B., "The U.S. National Security Strategy: policy, process, problems," Public Administration Review, 67:4, p 634-630, 2007.

Recommended:

5. Haskins, Greg, "A Practical Guide to Critical Thinking," <http://skepdic.com/essays/haskins.html>
6. Lett, James, "A field guide to critical thinking," <http://www.csicop.org/si/9012/critical-thinking.html>

Class 2: Sept 8 – National Security Policy Concepts

Readings:

1. DS: Part 2
2. EJK: Ch 1 and 8
3. Monroe Renwick, Kristen, "Paradigm shift: from rational choice to perspective," International Political Science Review, 22:2, p 151-172, 2001.
4. Jervis, Robert, "The implications of prospect theory for human nature and values," Political Psychology, 25:2, p 163-176, 2004.

Class 3: Sept 15 – National Security Policy in a Global Context

Readings:

1. EJK: Chs 2, 6, 9 and 11
2. Podesta, John and Peter Ogden, "The security implications of climate change," Washington Quarterly, 31, p 115-138, 2007-2008.
3. Klare, Michael T., "The new geopolitics of energy," Nation, 286, p 18-26, 2008.
4. The Annual Threat Assessment of the Intelligence Community for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 2009, http://www.dni.gov/testimonies/20090212_testimony.pdf
5. Freilich, Charles D., "National security decision-making in Israel: processes, pathologies and strengths," Middle East Journal, 60:4, p 635-663, 2006.
6. Campbell, David, "The biopolitics of security: oil, empire, and the sport utility vehicle," American Quarterly, 57:3, p 943-972, 2005.

Class 4: Sept 22 – National Security Policy Reforms

Readings:

1. EJK: Ch 12
2. Dale, Catherine, Nina Serafino and Pat Towell, "Organizing the U.S. Government for national security: overview of the interagency reform debates," CRS report for Congress: RL34455, 2008. <http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/natsec/RL34455.pdf>
3. Jackson, Brian A. and David R. Frelinger, "Emerging threats and security planning: how should we decide what hypothetical threats to worry about?" Washington DC: RAND Corporation (Occasional Paper), 2009.

4. Project for National Security Reform: Center for the Study of the Presidency, 2009 (Executive Summary and Case Study).
<http://www.pnsr.org/web/page/682/sectionid/579/pagelevel/2/interior.asp>

Class 5: Sept 29 – Understanding National Security Policy Formation, Part 1 – Governmental Instruments

Readings:

1. DS: Part 3
2. Best, Richard A. Jr., “The National Security Council: an organizational assessment,” CRS Report for Congress (RL 30840), 2009.
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL30840.pdf>
3. Project for National Security Reform: Center for the Study of the Presidency, 2009 (NSC Article).
<http://www.pnsr.org/web/page/682/sectionid/579/pagelevel/2/interior.asp>
4. Gookins, Amanda, J., “The role of intelligence in policy making,” SAIS Review, 28:1, p 65-75, 2008.
5. United States, Department of State, “Advisory Committee on Transformational Diplomacy – Final Report of the State Department in 2025 Working Group,” Washington DC, 2008,
<http://www.state.gov/documents/organizations/99879.pdf>
6. Randoll, Mark A., “Homeland security intelligence: perceptions, statutory definitions and approaches,” CRS Report for Congress (RL 33616), 2009.
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL33616.pdf>

Recommended:

7. Burke, John P., “The national security advisor and staff: transition challenges,” Presidential Studies Quarterly, 39:2, p 283-322, 2009.

Class 6: Oct 6 -- Understanding National Security Policy Formation, Part 2 – Nongovernmental Instruments

Guest Speaker: Tom Patterson, CEO National Security Grid

Readings:

1. DS: Part 4
2. Rollins, John and Anna C. Henning, “Comprehensive National Cybersecurity Initiative: legal authorities and policy considerations,” CRS Report for Congress (R40427), 2009. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40427.pdf>
3. Drezner, Daniel W., “The new world order,” Foreign Affairs, 86, p 34-46, 2007.
4. Stavridis, James G., “Strategic communication and national security,” Joint Forces Quarterly, 46, p 4-7, 2007.
5. Rothschild, Matthew, “The FBI deputizes business,” The Progressive, 72: 3, p 20-23, 2008.
6. “Media influence on national security decision-making (event transcript),” Brookings Institute, December 12, 2001,
<http://www.brookings.edu/events/2001/1212media---journalism.aspx?p=1>
7. Patterson, Tom and Dave Szady...Op-Ed, Huffington Post

MIDTERM exam questions assigned

Class 7: Oct 20 – MIDTERMS DUE – National Security Policy and History, Part 1

Readings:

1. NM: ch preface-6

Class 8: Oct 27 – National Security Policy and History, Part 2

Readings:

1. NM: ch 7-14

Class 9: Nov 3 -- National Security Policy Case Study: Cuban Missile Crisis

Readings:

1. AZ: ch 1-4
2. Allison, Graham, "The nightmare this time (Op-Ed)," Boston Globe, March 12, 2006

Class 10: Nov 10 – National Security Policy Case Study: From Cuba to Iraq

Readings:

1. AZ: ch 5-7
2. BW: ch 1-18

Class 11: Nov 17 – National Security Policy Case Study: Iraq War

Readings:

1. BW: ch 19-45
2. Jervis, Robert, "Reports, politics and intelligence failures: the case of Iraq," Journal of Strategic Studies, 29, p 3-52, 2006.

Class 12: Nov 24 -- NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY MOVIE NIGHT w/ commentary!

Class 13: Dec 1 – Final Presentations: Round 1

Class 14: Dec 8 – Final Presentations: Round 2