
PLCY 430
Analysis of US National Security Policy
Dr. Patricia L. Sullivan

Fall 2013
TR 3:30-4:45
Wilson 217

Office: Abernethy Hall 117
Office hours: Mondays 1:00-3:00 pm and by appt.

tsulli@email.unc.edu
919-962-0666

DESCRIPTION: This course will provide an overview of major issues in national security policymaking with an emphasis on evaluating the effectiveness, costs, and consequences of policy options. A major focus will be on appreciating the utility and limitations of the various policy instruments national leaders use in their attempts to attain foreign policy objectives. Students will learn about foreign policy tools, approaches, and strategies as well as methods of policy analysis.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- substantive knowledge of contemporary security issues
- critical thinking about the utility and limitations of various policy instruments
- the capacity to evaluate competing approaches to foreign policy
- understanding of the challenges of designing and implementing policy responses
- an understanding of how academic research can contribute to better policymaking
- an ability to construct well-reasoned arguments and express them both orally and in writing
- an ability to critically evaluate the quality and credibility of diverse sources of information

REQUIREMENTS: You will be evaluated based on your performance on:

1. a midterm exam (15%)
2. a team project and in-class debate (35%)
3. a position paper (15%)
4. your participation and contribution to the class (10%)
5. a final exam (25%)

Both exams will emphasize your ability to understand and *critically evaluate* the issues presented in the course. The final exam will be cumulative. All assignments are due at the beginning of class. Assignments turned in after this time will incur a grade penalty of 10% immediately and 5% each additional day after the deadline. I will not accept late assignments more than one week after the original deadline.

TEAM PROJECT: Each team (2-3 students representing one side of a debate topic) should work together to research the debate topic and prepare for the debate in front of the class. In addition to the in-class debate, teams are required to put together a portfolio with their opening and closing statements (with full citations) and a complete annotated bibliography.

Each individual student will be responsible for participating in online and in-person discussion and planning sessions, contributing to research and preparation for the debate, completing an evaluation of their team members, and participating in the in-class debate.

The debate project counts for 35% of your grade. Evaluation will be based on the following elements:

1. A team portfolio consisting of the following:
 - Your team's opening and closing statements (with full citations) (10 points)
 - Your team's complete annotated bibliography (15 points)
 - A list of cross-examination questions and major points to be made during the debate (5 points)

2. The overall quality of your team's debate performance (25 points)
3. The quality of your personal debate performance (15 points)
4. Your evaluations of the members of your group (5 points)
5. My assessment of your contribution to the project based on the evaluations completed by members of your group and your participation in discussion online (25 points)

POSITION PAPER: Each student will write a paper taking a position on an assigned topic and providing evidence for that position based on significant independent research. The purpose of the position paper is to deepen your understanding of a contemporary policy issue, to develop your ability to critically evaluate the quality and credibility of diverse sources of information, and to foster analytical and persuasive writing skills. You should write both to inform and to persuade. All sources should be properly cited. You must use parenthetical in-text citations and include a full bibliography. The grade you receive on the position paper will be 15% of your final grade. Due at the beginning of class on the day your topic is debated.

PARTICIPATION AND CONTRIBUTION: You are expected to do all of the assigned reading for this course before class and to attend all of the in-class debates. I highly recommend that you also attend all of the lectures. Much of the material that I will cover in lecture will not be in the readings and class exercises will be designed to deepen your understanding of core topics in the course. *If you must miss a class it will be your responsibility to get lecture notes, assignment instructions, etc... from a classmate.* Note: *anything* that takes place in class--including material from films, class discussions, and debates--is fair game for the tests and the final exam. Your participation grade will be based on (1) my evaluation of the quality and consistency of your participation in class and (2) written responses to four of the in-class debates.

1. Come to class prepared to contribute. Do not read the newspaper, conduct side conversations with other students, or use any electronic device while class is in progress. If you wish to use a laptop to take notes you must complete the request posted online.
2. Most students will receive a B+ for participation. Extraordinary contribution to class can earn you a higher grade. A disruptive classroom presence, notable absences, failure to participate in class, or missing debate responses will lower your grade.

REQUIRED READING: There is one assigned book for this course:

Sullivan, Patricia. 2012. *Who Wins? Predicting Strategic Success and Failure in Armed Conflict* New York: Oxford University Press.

Any royalties I receive for sale of the book this semester will be donated to [Hope For The Warriors](#), a national nonprofit organization, founded in North Carolina, that supports U.S. service members wounded or killed in action and their families.

Links to additional assigned reading are provided under the "Resources" section on Sakai . You are also expected to make a habit of reading a daily newspaper with high quality coverage of foreign affairs and/or listening to a public radio station for news and analyses of events related to national security.

COURSE WEBSITE: Assignments, readings, links to resources, announcements, and your grades can all be accessed on Sakai. You need to have an email account and regular access to the internet to successfully complete this course. To ensure that you receive my emails, you should either check your Sakai account on a regular basis or have email from the site forwarded to an account you do check regularly.

GRADE APPEALS: I take the evaluation and grading of your academic work very seriously. If you feel that a test or assignment was graded incorrectly or unfairly you must submit a type-written explanation of the problem along with the test or assignment in question. I will re-evaluate your work and you will receive the new grade

whether it is higher or lower. I am always happy to discuss with you how your work was evaluated and how you can improve your performance in the course but I *will not* change any grade without a written request. The only exception to this policy is for simple errors in calculation. Grade appeals will only be accepted for 10 days after a test or assignment has been returned to the class.

GRADE DEFINITIONS: The following definitions of grades were adopted by the University Faculty and are the official basis for assigning and interpreting undergraduate grades. Note that they are based on performance, not on effort or on individual improvement.

A - Mastery of course content at the highest level of attainment that can reasonably be expected of students at a given stage of development. The A grade states clearly that the student has shown such outstanding promise in the aspect of the discipline under study that he/she may be strongly encouraged to continue.

B - Strong performance demonstrating a high level of attainment for a student at a given stage of development. The B grade states that the student has shown solid promise in the aspect of the discipline under study.

C - A totally acceptable performance demonstrating an adequate level of attainment for a student at a given stage of development. The C grade states that, while not yet showing any unusual promise, the student may continue to study in the discipline with reasonable hope of intellectual development.

D - A marginal performance in the required exercises demonstrating a minimal passing level of attainment for a student at a given stage of development. The D grade states that the student has given no evidence of prospective growth in the discipline.

F - For whatever reasons, an unacceptable performance. The F grade indicates that the student's performance in the required exercises has revealed almost no understanding of the course content.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has had a student-administered honor system and judicial system for over 100 years. The Honor Code of the university is in effect at all times, and the submission of work signifies understanding and acceptance of those requirements. If you have questions about your responsibility under the honor code, please bring them to your instructor or consult with the office of the Dean of Students or the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance (<http://instrument.unc.edu>). Papers and exams should be submitted with the following pledge: "On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment." Never submit work unless you are fully satisfied that you have complied with the requirements of the Honor Code.

FINAL NOTES:

- Cell phones should be turned off and put away when class begins. Do not read the newspaper, conduct side conversations with other students, send or read text messages, or browse your friends' Instagram posts while class is in progress. If you wish to use a laptop to take notes you must complete the request posted online. Students engaging in any activity that could interfere with other students' ability to learn will be asked to leave class. Students who use their laptop or tablet to engage in any tasks unrelated to the course will lose the privilege of using these devices in my classroom. A word of advice: I have teenagers – don't test the limits on this one.
- Students who will need to miss a test or class meeting to observe a religious holiday at some point during the semester should make arrangements with me within the first two weeks of the semester.
- Students with disabilities who require individualized testing or other accommodations should discuss this with me within as soon as possible.

- Students should keep copies of the assignments they turn in and retain graded assignments, tests, and exams until they receive their final course grade.
- If any problems that will affect your performance in this class arise during the course of the semester, please come see me as soon as possible. I can do more to help you if you let me know what is happening *before* you miss a test or deadline.
- In written work (including overheads or handouts used in presentations) words drawn from others should be indicated by quotation marks and all ideas drawn from others should refer to their source. If you are unsure about what needs to be cited, please talk with me or ask for assistance from the writing center. Plagiarism is a serious offense which can result in failure of the course and suspension from the University. I will report all suspected cases of plagiarism to the Honor Court
- Email Etiquette: Please feel free to email me to set up an appointment to meet. I will not respond to emails asking about what you missed in class when you were absent. In addition, I will not accept assignments that are emailed to me except under extraordinary circumstances. You should address me as Professor or Dr. Sullivan in your emails just as you would in person. Be sure to include your full name and the name or number of the course in every email.

COURSE OUTLINE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

Date	Topic	Assignment
20 Aug	Introduction	Course syllabus
22 Aug	Grand Strategy	Mandelbaum, Michael. 2006. "David's Friend Goliath." <i>Foreign Policy</i> 151 (January/February): 1-5. Posen, Barry R. 2013. "Pull Back." <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92, no. 1: 116. Brooks, Stephen G. 2013. "Lean forward: in defense of American engagement." <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92, no. 1.
27 Aug	Brief History of U.S. National Security Strategy	Executive Office of the President. National Security Council. 1950. <i>NSC 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security</i> . Washington: NSC. Kennan, George F. ("X"). 1947. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 25 (July): 575-82.
29 Aug	Power: What is it good for?	Trager, Robert F., and Dessislava P. Zagorcheva. 2006. Deterring Terrorism: It Can Be Done. <i>International Security</i> 30 (3):87-123. Pape, Robert A. 1998. Why Economic Sanctions Still Do Not Work. <i>International Security</i> 22 (2):66-77.
3 Sep	Conventional Military Power	Wilson, Isaiah. 2007. "What Weapons Do We Have and What Can They Do?" <i>PS: Political Science and Politics</i> 40 (July): 473-78. Krepinevich, Andrew F., Jr. "The Pentagon's Wasting Assets: The Eroding Foundations of American Power." <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 88, no. 4 (2009): 18.
5 Sep	U.S. Defense Budget	Masters, Jonathan. "Debt, Deficits, and the Defense Budget." Feb 2013. Council on Foreign Relations. Aug 2013. http://www.cfr.org/defense-budget/debt-deficits-defense-budget/p27318 Colina, Tom Z. "Nuke the Budget: Why are nuclear weapons off the budget negotiating table? They're where we should start. <i>Foreign Policy</i> . August 9, 2013.

10 Sep	U.S. Defense Budget	"Tightening the Pentagon's Belt." Jul 2011. Council on Foreign Relations. http://www.cfr.org/defense-budget/tightening-pentagons-belt/p25548
12 Sep	Strategic Intelligence	Jervis, Robert. "Reports, Politics, and Intelligence Failures: The Case of Iraq." <i>Journal Of Strategic Studies</i> 29, no. 1 (2006): 3-52. Davis, Jack. "Intelligence Analysts and Policymakers: Benefits and Dangers of Tensions in the Relationship." <i>Intelligence and National Security</i> 21, no. 6 (2006): 999-1021.
17 Sep	Nuclear Weapons and U.S. Nuclear Strategy	"How Many and Where Were the Nukes? What the U.S. Government No Longer Wants You to Know about Nuclear Weapons During the Cold War." National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 197. Edited by William Burr. Posted August 18, 2006. http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB197/index.htm
19 Sep	Nuclear Proliferation	Johnson, Toni. "Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) Backgrounder. Fifteen Nuclear Agendas to Watch." Updated: May 27, 2010. http://www.cfr.org/proliferation/fifteen-nuclear-agendas-watch/p22023 Sagan, Scott D. "The Causes of Nuclear Weapons Proliferation." <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 14, no. 1 (2011): 225-44.
24 Sep	CBR weapons	Stern, Jessica. 2002/03. Dreaded Risks and the Control of Biological Weapons. <i>International Security</i> 27 (3):89-123.
26 Sep	Review	
1 Oct	Midterm Exam	
3 Oct	Domestic Politics and Security Policy	McMahon, Robert. "Balance of War Powers: The U.S. President and Congress." Jun, 2011. Council on Foreign Relations. http://www.cfr.org/united-states/balance-war-powers-us-president-congress/p13092 Gelpi, Christopher, and Peter D. Feaver. 2002. Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick? Veterans in the Political Elite and the American Use of Force. <i>American Political Science Review</i> 96 (4):779-793.
8 Oct	The Utility of Force	Sullivan <i>Who Wins?</i> Chapters 1-3
10 Oct	The Scientific Study of Conflict Processes	Sullivan <i>Who Wins?</i> Chapters 4 and 5
15 Oct	Debate 1	Has the increasing use of unmanned aerial system (drone) strikes to target suspected terrorists improved U.S. national security? Johnston, Patrick B. 2012. Does Decapitation Work? Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership Targeting in Counterinsurgency Campaigns. <i>International Security</i> 36 (4):47-79. Zenko, Micah, and Emma Welch. "Where the Drones Are." 29 May 2012. <i>Foreign Policy</i> .
17 Oct	Fall Break	
22 Oct	Military Strategy	Andres, Richard B., Craig Wills, and Thomas E. Griffith Jr. "Winning with Allies: The Strategic Value of the Afghan Model." <i>International Security</i> 30, no. 3 (2005):

		124-60. Biddle, Stephen D. "Allies, Airpower, and Modern Warfare: The Afghan Model in Afghanistan and Iraq." <i>International Security</i> 30, no. 3 (2005): 161-76.
24 Oct	War Aims and War Outcomes	Sullivan <i>Who Wins?</i> Chapters 6 and 7
29 Oct	Debate 2	Should the US attack Iran and attempt to eliminate its nuclear facilities? Kroenig, Matthew, "Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike Is the Least Bad Option," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> , Vol. 91, No. 1 (January/February 2012), pp. 76-86 Debs, Alexandre & Nuno Monteiro, "The Flawed Logic of Striking Iran," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> , Vol. 91, No. 4 (July/August 2012), pp. 2-5.
31 Oct	Debate 3	Should the US cut off military aid to Pakistan? Michelle Kelemen. The U.S. Holds The Aid Card, Yet Egypt Still Trumps. National Public Radio. July 06, 2013. mp3 (on Sakai) Bapat, Navin A. 2011. Transnational terrorism, US military aid, and the incentive to misrepresent. <i>Journal of Peace Research</i> 48 (3):303-318. Markey, Daniel. "A False Choice in Pakistan." <i>Foreign Affairs</i> , Vol. 86, No. 4 (Jul. - Aug., 2007), pp. 85-102
5 Nov	Counterinsurgency	FM 3-24 Counterinsurgency, Chapter 1: "Insurgency and Counterinsurgency" and Chapter 5 pp. 18-15: "Counterinsurgency Approaches". http://www.fas.org/irp/doddir/army/fm3-24.pdf Luttwak, Edward. "Dead End: Counterinsurgency Warfare as Military Malpractice" <i>Harper's Magazine</i> , February 2007, 33-42.
7 Nov	Terrorism	Kydd, Andrew H., and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." <i>International Security</i> 31 (1): 49-80. Abrahms, Max. "Does Terrorism Really Work? Evolution in The Conventional Wisdom Since 9/11." <i>Defence and Peace Economics</i> , 2011. Vol. 22(6), December, pp. 583-594.
12 Nov	Terrorism	Mueller, John. 2010. Assessing Measures Designed to Protect the Homeland. <i>Policy Studies Journal</i> 30 (1):1-21.
14 Nov	Debate 4	Should the U.S. Intervene in Syria? Bajoria, Jayshree, and Robert McMahon. "The Dilemma of Humanitarian Intervention." Jun 2013. Council on Foreign Relations. (web link on Sakai)
19 Nov	Civil-Military Relations	
21 Nov	Debate 5	Do the NSA's surveillance programs go too far? Masters, Jonathan, and Greg Bruno. "U.S. Domestic Surveillance." Jun 2013. Council on Foreign Relations. June 2013. (web link on Sakai)
26 Nov	Debate 6	Is the use of harsh interrogation techniques (e.g., waterboarding) for terrorism suspects justified in order to decrease the threat of a terrorist attack? Beehner, Lionel. 2005. "Torture, the United States, and Laws of War." November 2005. Council on Foreign Relations. (web link on Sakai)

		Krauthammer, Charles. 2005. "The Truth About Torture, It's Time to Be Honest about Doing Terrible Things." <i>The Weekly Standard</i> 11 (December 5).
3 Dec	Final Review	
Final Exam:		

This course syllabus is a general plan for the course. The course outline and assignments will be revised and updated regularly. The most up-to-date syllabus will always be posted on Sakai.