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INTERNATIONAL SECURITY 1

COURSE OVERVIEW

COURSE DESCRIPTION

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 4-Plus-1 (Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and Violent Extremist Organizations), enabling students to devise 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 (CJCS 4-Plus-1) and identify appropriate strategic responses to those threats.

COURSE QUESTIONS

1. How does each IR tradition conceive international security, and what does this say about politics in the international system?
2. How do current opportunities and challenges in the international system complicate our understanding of international security?
3. What is the nature of each threat identified by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 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 acting in the field. 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 international order as bolstered by assumptions derived from the three traditions as a way to comprehend the purpose, role, and function of US grand strategy.

Phase II of the course considers the opportunities and challenges for US grand strategy embedded in the current strategic environment. It first introduces students to the concept of grand strategy, as well as how this is informed by the traditions studied in Phase I. It then unpacks the concepts of globalization, nationalism, human security, WMD 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 2015 National Security Strategy: Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and violent extremist organizations (4-Plus-1). 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. 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.

In order to create 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 comprehensive understandings 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.

JOINT LEARNING AREAS AND OBJECTIVES (JPME-1)

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:

1 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, CJCS Visions for Joint Officer Development (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 2005), p. 2.
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, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, and 528 discuss the current security challenges to US national interests in the form of the 4+1.

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.
   - Lesson IS1 – 500 directly relates the course to the National Security Strategy 2015 and the Joint Operating Environment 2016.
   - Lessons IS1 – 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 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.

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.
e. 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.
   - Lesson IS1 – 510 discusses US grand strategy broadly.
   - Lessons IS1 – 511, 512, 515, 516, 517, and 518 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, and 528 indirectly address regional differentiation in security environments.

Learning Area 6 – Joint Operational Leadership and the Profession of Arms
Comprehend the role of the Profession of Arms in the contemporary environment.

- All course lessons seek to understand the contemporary security environment and the role of the Profession of Arms alongside other elements of national power within it.

e. Communicate with clarity and precision.

- All course lessons seek to engage student critical thinking, reasoning, and problem solving in order to develop thoughtful communicators.

**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, while afternoon lectures apply the theories and concepts presented in the readings and discussed in seminar to historical and contemporary case studies.

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: one four-to-five page take-home, written assignment and a final, in-class, written 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: One four to five-page take-home examination worth 40% of the grade and one six to seven-page take home final examination worth 60% of the 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). To avoid confusion, the syllabus denotes all readings posted on the Common Drive as “EL” (“electronic”). In addition, lecture slides will be posted on the Common Drive, every Friday at 1230.
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) or Wg Cdr Rich Milburn (Deputy Course Director).
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY 1: THE CONTEXT OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
COURSE SCHEDULE

DAY 0 – COURSE INTRODUCTION

DATE: TBD

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: 1.0-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: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS
1. NSS 2015 [EL]
2. JOE 2035 (Joint Operating Environment: The Joint Force in a Contested and Disordered World, July 2016.) [EL]
DAY 1 – REALISM

DATE: 17 October 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the various strands of realism, including offensive realism, defensive realism, and power-transition theory.
2. Apply realism in order to better understand the occurrence of war in the international system.
3. Analyze the end of the Cold War through the lens of realism.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-502 (L): Classical Realism and Power-Transition Theory: 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

IS1-503 (S): Offensive Realism, Defensive Realism, and the Quiet Exit of the Soviet Union
Overview: The IR tradition of realism develops around a concern about power and material capabilities. Because our world can currently be described as a Hobbesian “anarchic system of states,” interstate relations are based around self-help doctrines, and thus each state can only expect the other to do what is best for itself. Inevitably, the interests of states will come to an impasse, and it is here that war occurs (Mearsheimer 2001). The key distinction between offensive and defensive realism (structural realism) lies in how states seek security, through domination or by maintaining the balance of power. The intention of security-seeking states matters to other states, and how those states interpret intention leads them to employ either positive inducements or threats of punishment to maintain the balance of power. These strategies must be implemented with caution, for each can lead to war (Van Evera 2009). Realism predicts the peaceful end of the Cold War by distinguishing between “winning” and “losing” states in the balance of power (Wohlfforth 1994/5).

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

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
IS1-504 (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

IS1-505 (S): Liberal Thought and the Institutional Development of a Democratic World
Overview: Unlike realism and its foundational set of assumptions, the IR tradition of liberalism has been said to account for a set of family resemblances, or values. Specifically, rights (individual and/or collective), justice (economic and/or civic), and fairness (rational, not idealistic). Fiedler and LaSaine (2005) demonstrate these tensions between 19th century liberal thought and 20th century liberal internationalism. The authors describe the conceptual development of the democratic peace, which is explored through a US foreign policy lens by Hampton (2009). The idea that liberal democratic states can create peaceful relations across the international system through trade and institutions is tested and largely confirmed by Oneal and Russett (1999). Deudney and Ikenberry (1991/2) attribute the peaceful end of the Cold War to the liberal international environment constructed by the US and its allies that placed certain constraints on Soviet responses to decline.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS


DAY 3 – CONSTRUCTIVISM

DATE: 24 October 2017

LENNON 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
IS1-506 (L): Constructivism: From Philosophy to Strategy: 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

IS1-507 (S): The Three Images of Constructivism, and How the First Caused Soviet Decline
Overview: Constructivism sets itself apart from realism and liberalism by arguing that the world can be understood as a distribution of meaning, rather than one of material capabilities that may or may not be regulated by institutional frameworks. Wendt (1992) makes the claim that realism and liberalism are “undersocialized.” That is, reality is socially constructed through the exchange of ideas that form shared knowledge. Essentially, the character of international life is determined by the beliefs and expectations that states have about each other. Since the author is discussing the structure of the system (as we have with realism and liberalism to this point) this is a “Third Image” argument. Hopf (1998) opens up the aperture of the state (Second Image), clarifying and extending Wendt to speak specifically about the construction of state identities and interests depending on cultural, historical, political, and social context. The author identifies limitations in the realist and liberal traditions and explains how constructivism can be used to address those shortcomings. If ideas structure the interactions of people and states, then changing or newly adopted ideas can change the structure of the system. Thomas (2005) uses this assumption to demonstrate how the peaceful end of the Cold War can be attributed to the declining belief in the Soviet Union by its citizenry, as they witnessed its human rights abuses throughout the second half of the 20th century.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

DAY 4 – INTERNATIONAL ORDER

DATE: 27 October 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the various types of international order.
2. Apply insights from realism, liberalism, and constructivism that inform how a foreign policy might engage the international order.
3. Examine the end of the Cold War and the process through which the current international order came into being.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-508 (S): International Order and the Post-Cold War Unipolar Moment

Overview: How has the current liberal international order come into being, and can it survive without the United States at the helm? While Ikenberry (2001) uses elements of realism and liberalism to argue that the United States has the ability to construct an order that can outlive its primacy, Waltz (2000) suggests that institutions are only as durable as the states that have vested interest in their continuation.

To accommodate the afternoon lecture, morning seminar will be held from 0800 – 1100 and afternoon seminar will be held from 1200-1500.

Activity: Negotiating the End of the Cold War

CONTACT HOURS: 3.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

IS1-509 (L): The History of US Foreign Policy: Dr. J.T. LaSaine

Overview: Historical patterns in United States foreign relations provide important clues to future developments in national policy and strategy. These patterns may be identified at the structural, societal and individual levels of analysis. Structural patterns derive from the nation’s geopolitical and economic position in the world system; societal patterns from the institutional arrangements prescribed by the United States constitution, and the enduring, ideological characteristics of American political culture; individual patterns from the cognitive characteristics of the human actors in politics and the policy making process. Historically, these structural, societal and individual patterns in United States foreign relations have motivated, shaped, and constrained both the development of national military power, and national strategies for the employment of military power as an instrument of policy. Historical analysis of these relationships can provide timely insights into political-military issues likely to be of acute importance to current and future military strategists and policy advisors.
The lecture will be delivered from 1530-1630, and will prepare the students for the readings assigned for Day 5: US Foreign Policy and the Context of Grand Strategy.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2015 p16, 23-28
JOE 2016 p5-9

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT
MIDTERM ISSUED
DAY 5 – US FOREIGN POLICY AND THE CONTEXT OF GRAND STRATEGY

DATE: 31 October 2017

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. Assess some of the future options for US grand strategy.

LESSON OVERVIEW
No Lecture: Contact hour will be used to answer student questions concerning the first exam.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour strategic pause

IS1-510 (S): The Changing Context and Concepts of Grand Strategy
Overview: We find ourselves in a transitional era of American foreign policy. Posen and Ross (1996/7) provide us with four potential grand strategies that the US might adopt moving forward. One in particular, “retrenchment” or “neo-isolationism,” is examined and endorsed by Layne (2012) as the US strategic environment shifts from unipolar to multipolar. This viewpoint is countered by Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth (2012). Mead (2017) offers the capstone to this day, a typology of foreign policy eras, demonstrating how domestic politics in the US can influence grand strategy to a great degree.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2015
NDS 2008
NMS 2015
DAY 6 – GLOBALIZATION

DATE: 3 November 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the various dimensions of globalization and their dynamics in the international system.
2. Examine the impact of globalization on security practices.
3. Assess how US grand strategy should accommodate for various dimensions of globalization.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-511 (L): International Political Economy: Dr. Gabriel Aguilera
Overview: Economic globalization is defined by an 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 also can 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.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-512 (S): Globalization(s) and Implications for International Security
Overview: Economic globalization is merely one form of this not-so-new phenomena. Keohane and Nye (2000) not only unravel the concept of globalization into four dimensions, but the authors give the reader tools to understand the various dynamics of globalization and its effects. Higgit (2004) demonstrates how the economic and military dimensions of globalization have overlapped in US foreign policy, and how different US grand strategies can affect existing multilateral commitments. Kilcullen (2013) shifts gears to look at the enhanced threat of non-state actors to international security as a result of increased globalization. Hoffman (2002) clarifies this growing importance of entities outside the state, reminding us that great power rivalry is still a reality of our world, and that these new security issues must be conceptualized within the context of the anarchic state system.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar
REQUIRED READINGS


RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NDS 2008 p4-5, 16
NMS 2015 p2
JOE 2016 p10-14, 30-32
DAY 7 – NATIONALISM

DATE: 7 November 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the distinction between nationalism as an imagined community and nationalism as a political project.
2. Assess how realism, liberalism, and constructivism inspire various interpretations of nationalism, collective identities, and state sovereignty.
3. Discuss what this means for US grand strategy and the future of international security.

LESSON OVERVIEW

IS1-513 (L): Nationalism, the State and Politics: Dr. Matthew Schwonek
Overview: The nation is conceptualized as a political community, the largest and most powerful with which humans identify and assert themselves. The modern point of view tends to see a world of nations. Nationalism as a doctrine is concerned with the relation of the political community to the state. Nationalism is best understood, therefore, as a type of politics. The nation demands the nation-state, but this proposition is not so easily realized, as its history suggests.

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. Anderson (2016 [1983]) attempts an explanation by contextualizing nationalism as an imagined, sovereign, community, in which conceptions of the state are not only reified in the minds of its citizens, but are connected to a larger, more ancient, cultural history. Kaldor (2004) addresses the contest between globalization and nationalism directly, emphasizing that nationalism is a political project driven by conflict and war between states. The author locates nationalism in the current strategic environment as primarily a transnational reaction to increasing globalization, and a retreat to former conceptions of the nation-state. She then pits this ideal-type against its opposite, cosmopolitanism, which is suggested to be more structurally functional under increasing globalization. Brands (2017) finds little evidence of cosmopolitanism in US grand strategy, instead revealing a spectrum of US nationalisms informing foreign policy debates. The implication here is that there are a many conceptions of nationalism that have varying effects on unity and statehood. Thus, we must consider the possibility that not all national projects can be culturally or politically successful. Eriksen (2016) considers the underlying factors that contribute to weakened national identities, raising the potential for other types of collective identity to take hold.

REQUIRED READINGS


**RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE**

JOE 2016 p12-14, 22-23
LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the various types of human security and their relation to national security.
2. Assess 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): Assessing State Responses to Human (In)Security
Overview: If it is possible to integrate Kaaldor’s (2004) cosmopolitanism into US grand strategy, human security must be its referent object. Reveron and Mahoney-Norris (2011) outline the fundamentally components of human security, and suggest that the many challenges facing the US in an increasingly globalized world are spurred by human insecurity. While the authors downplay the role of the military outside of careful implementation of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), Capie (2014) argues that hard military power applied appropriately can complement soft power goals. Levene (2004) challenges both sets of authors’ underlying assumptions, suggesting that responsibility for human rights violations “in the name of the state” lies with the very powers that underpin the dominance of a nation-state system. There is, of course, no strategic solution to this problem, but this discussion should reveal how our underlying assumptions set parameters for our strategic decisions and actions.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar
**REQUIRED READINGS**


**RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE**

NSS 2015 p12-14, 17-18, 20-22
JOE 2016 p36-39
DAY 9 – WMD PROLIFERATION

DATE: 17 November 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
2. Evaluate the Ganguly-Kapur debate: Do nuclear weapons stabilize or destabilize the Indo-Pakistani relationship?
3. Comprehend concern about the further spread of nuclear weapons around the world.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-517 (L): Weapons of Mass Destruction or Disruption (WMD/D): Dr. Chuck Costanzo
Overview: The lecture examines challenges and threats posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or disruption (WMD/D), constraints on this proliferation, why these constraints are not always effective, and some of the implications and consequences of failed attempts to halt WMD/D proliferation.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-518 (S): Nuclear Stability in South Asia
Overview: Following nuclear explosive tests by India and Pakistan in May 1998, debate ensued whether nuclear weapons in the arsenals of these long-time antagonists would stabilize or destabilize South Asia. This lesson explores this debate and the concerns it raises about further nuclear proliferation around the globe.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS


RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2015 p11
NDS 2008 p14-15

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT
MIDTERM DUE
DAY 10 – CYBER

DATE: 21 November 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the debate surrounding the institutionalization of cyber.
2. Apply insights from realism, liberalism, and constructivism that inform this debate.
3. Assess options for US foreign policy in approaching the institutionalization of cyber.

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.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour movie

IS1-520 (S): The Possibility of Cyber Norms
Overview: Forsyth and Pope (2014) argue that cyber is simply another domain in which states may compete. As a result of this, great powers will be incentivized to shore up their influence by institutionalizing the cyber domain with rules, norms and standards, thereby constraining competition. The strategic implications of this argument are obvious, the US should work to establish and maintain organizations that regulate state and non-state conduct in cyberspace. Mazenac (2015) labels cyber as an emerging-technology, and by exploring the development of norms surrounding past emerging-technologies, concludes that states will not inevitably cooperate and establish regulatory institutions. Nonetheless, the author seems to support Forsyth and Pope’s (2014) strategy of supporting organizations that could constrain cyber-proliferating states and make cyberwar less likely.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS

2. Brian M. Mazenac, “Why International Order in Cyberspace is Not Inevitable,” Strategic Studies Quarterly (Summer 2015), 78-95. [EL]

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NSS 2015 p12-13
JOE 2016 p33-36,
PHASE III: EMERGING MULTI-POLARITY, 21ST CENTURY SECURITY ISSUES

DAY 11– IRAN/NORTH KOREA

DATE: 28 November 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Comprehend the historical context within which interactions between the US and Iran 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
IS1-521 (L): North Korea: Dr. Bruce Bechtol
Overview: Sagan (1996/7) uses elements of the IR Traditions to provide the student with a broad theoretical foundation for why states like North Korea or Iran may be incentivized to proliferate. Narang (2015) puts forth a typology of nuclear strategies to analyze the foreign policy postures of nuclear and nuclearizing states, suggesting different pressures at the international and domestic levels promote strategy adoption.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

REQUIRED READINGS


LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-522 (S): Sticks or Carrots for Iran?
Overview: Kinzer (2008) provides a critical interpretation of the historical relationship between the United States and Iran, setting up a particular understanding of the current political context in which recent and future negotiations over the nuclear issue have taken and will take place. Within this context, Cohen, Edelman, and Takeyh (2016) offer an aggressive strategic approach towards Iran, as it continues to participate in nefarious regional activity. While agreeing with the authors on proposed objectives toward Iran, Dobbins (2011) advances a more measured approach, advocating an engaged diplomatic and soft power approach to Iran, coupled with deterrence and sanction strategy.
REQUIRED READINGS
Understanding the Threat


Debating Strategic Responses


CONTACT HOURS: 2-hour seminar

RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NDS 2008 p3
NMS 2015 p2
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
IS1-523 (L): China as a New Nation-State: From Dynastic Empire to Westphalian Great Power: 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

IS1-524 (S): China’s Ascent and US Foreign Policy

Overview: The rise of China has been interpreted in distinct and contrasting ways by adherents to different IR Traditions. Typically, realist scholars have anticipated a future China hostile to the US-led international order. Legro (2008) challenges this assumption, citing a
misunderstanding of Chinese intentions interpreted based on the dominant foreign policy ideas of Chinese leadership. Yu (2014) turns the argument on its head, suggesting that the rise of populist nationalism in the historical memory of the populace has forced the Chinese leadership to adopt a more revisionist posture toward the international order. Art (2010) accepts the inexorability of China’s rise, and assesses the viability of US containment responses, primarily through economic means. Green and Goodman (2016) compliment this discussion, demonstrating the geopolitical intentions of the recently failed Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. Additionally, Art (2010) outlines the primary interests of the US in East Asia and their policy implications.

**CONTACT HOURS:** 2.0-hour Seminar

### REQUIRED READINGS

**Understanding the Threat**


**Debating Strategic Responses**


### RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE

NDS 2008 p3, 10
NMS 2015 p2
DAY 13 – RUSSIA

DATE: 5 December 2017

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
IS1-525 (L): Russian Strategic Culture: Dr. Mary Hampton.
Overview: The lecture traces the evolution of Russian grand strategic thinking since the end of the Cold War. The optimism of the Gorbachev reforms and early Yeltsin years revealed an openness to increased cooperation/interdependence/integration with the West. Gorbachev spoke of the Common European Home; he sought better relations with Europe and especially with the US, a relationship that began to blossom by the end of the Reagan years. These goals and the optimism among Russian political and foreign policy making elites unraveled by the end of the 1990s due to the tremendous failures of domestic reform and what was increasingly interpreted as a betrayal by the West through NATO enlargement. Under Putin, Russia began re-casting its role and identity. Putin’s Russia sought to restore national power to its former greatness and to reassert national influence in the near abroad and other areas where Russian influence had been rolled back or marginalized. Putin became more aggressive and began mobilizing public opinion around a forceful nationalism with an irredentist tilt. Many in the West did not take much notice of the changing face of Russian foreign policy until the annexation of Crimea and the military intervention into eastern Ukraine in 2014. Since then, opinions regarding the threat posed by Russia have differed, but NATO is responding by slowly re-rallying around Article V. The lecture addresses a few alternative strategies that the US might pursue, and briefly sets up seminar discussion in suggesting how the 3 theoretical approaches differ in this regard.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-526 (S): Russia Resurgent: Causes, Effects, and US Policy Responses
Overview: The 2014 Ukraine crisis brought existing tensions between Russia and the United States to a sudden head, and left many attributing Russian aggression to a defensive mechanism in the face of further Western expansion through NATO and the EU (Mearsheimer 2014). To some, however, the question of why events like this occur invites a deeper examination of the Russian political context. Ziegler (2012) uses realist-inspired balance of power politics, as well as constructivist interpretations of sovereignty and ideological conceptions of the self to explain Russia’s reassertion as a great power competitor. To reverse this competitive relationship, Krickovic (2016) advocates the establishment of informal binding arrangements to shift the concerns of each about relative gains. Pending the effectiveness of informal institutional binding, another US policy option would be to continue supporting the self-determination of recalcitrant Russian subordinates. Driscoll and Maliniak (2016) warn against this strategy, arguing that US support might incentivize the state or non-state actor to become more risk-acceptant, potentially drawing the US into unwanted military confrontation.
REQUIRED READINGS
Understanding the Threat


Debating Strategic Responses


RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
NDS p3-4, 10-11
NMS 2015 p2
DAY 14– VEOs

DATE: 12 December 2017

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
Overview: This lecture identifies terrorism as a tool used by political actors to claim power. While the implementation of terrorist practices looks irrational to external audiences, a group’s use of terror is a strategic decision intended to satisfy the political group and ensure its survival, as well as attain some desired political outcome. The politics of terrorism shift along with group interests, and US policymakers should be aware of this so that our counter-VEO strategies might shift with them.

CONTACT HOURS: 1.0-hour lecture

IS1-528 (S): VEOs: An Existential Threat?
Overview: Gerges (2016) provides historical context for the development of ISIS (Da’esh). Within this account, the author highlights the various and distinct forms, interests, and strategies that violent extremist organizations (VEOs) might adopt, with a particular focus on the contribution of failed states to the successful rise of VEOs. Mueller and Stewart (2016) contend that while groups like ISIS and Al Qaeda may be dangerous in a regional context, the US has overestimated their danger as a national security threat. The debate over the VEO threat is of particular importance to US grand strategy. Since Cronin (2012) identifies the ISIS threat as distinct from the threat of Al Qaeda, her policy prescriptions vary from VEO to VEO in terms of strategies of engagement or restraint. Byman (2016) on the other hand, sees many VEOs as an extension of ISIS – i.e. the “Al Qaeda affiliates” identified in the NSS – and thus supports a universal strategy of engagement.

CONTACT HOURS: 2.0-hour seminar

REQUIRED READINGS
Understanding the Threat


Debating Strategic Responses


**RELATED STRATEGIC GUIDANCE**

NSS 2015 p9-10  
NDS 2008 p2, 7-9  
NMS 2015 p3, 8, 11  
JOE 2016 p22-23
DAY 15: BOMBSHELL

DATE: 15 December 2017

LESSON OBJECTIVES
1. Demonstrate how key course concepts are utilized by national security practitioners to assess various security strategies.
2. Analyze contemporary security challenges and proposed strategic solutions from a defense industry perspective.
3. Provide an introduction to concepts that will be explored in International Security II: The Conduct of National Security.

LESSON OVERVIEW
IS1-529 (P): This bi-weekly podcast, brought to you by War on the Rocks, is hosted by three Washington insiders who dissect today’s foreign policy crises and tomorrow’s security challenges. The hosts – Loren DeJonge Schulman, Radha Iyengar Plumb, and Erin Simpson – use the content and concepts examined throughout this course to interpret, analyze, and evaluate contemporary issues in national security and military strategy.

CONTACT HOURS: 3.0-hour panel
COURSE FACULTY

Lt Col Jonathan Arnett, PhD, is an Associate Professor of National Security Studies in the Department of International Security at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC). Lt Col Arnett earned his PhD in political science from the Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy at the State University of New York in Albany. He is a graduate of the US Air Force Academy and a 2006 graduate of Air Command and Staff College.

Lt Col Lawrence "Hap" Arnold is the Air National Guard Advisor to the Commandant of Air War College for Officer Professional Military Education (OPME). Additionally, he is an instructor at Air Command & Staff College's Department of International Security (DEI). He holds an Associate's Degree from the CCAF, a Bachelor's Degree from the University of South Carolina, and a Master's Degree from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University and recently completed Advanced Joint Professional Military Education (AJPME) from National Defense University (NDU), Joint Forces Staff College, at NAS Norfolk, Virginia. Prior to coming to Air University, Lt Col Arnold was a C-130 Navigator in the Air National Guard flying worldwide airlift missions. In 2009 he accepted a 3-year assignment to HQ USAFCENT/US Embassy - Abu Dhabi, as the Country Desk Officer for the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and USAF liaison officer to the UAE Air Force and Air Defense. From 2012 - 2016, he was assigned to HQ 1AF/USAFNORTH and worked a multitude of Security Cooperation issues with Mexican and Canadian Armed Forces. He began his military career as an enlisted Air Traffic Controller in the Air National Guard.

Dr. Terry Beckenbaugh is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Security at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) at Maxwell Air Force Base. He came to ACSC from the US Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, where he taught for nine years in the Department of Military History. Dr. Beckenbaugh received his PhD in 19th Century US History from the University of Arkansas, and his Masters and Bachelors in US History and History, respectively, from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania. Beckenbaugh has taught at a variety of undergraduate and graduate civilian institutions. He is currently working on a book on the White River Campaign in Arkansas in the spring-summer of 1862, and has numerous publications and conference presentations.

Major Charlie Bueker is an Air Command and Staff College AY17 graduate and serves as an instructor in Air Command and Staff College's Department of International Security. Additionally, as the Political-Military Affairs Strategist (PAS) Course Director, he is tasked to deliberately develop field grade officers into international affairs specialists who will build positive relationships with global partners. Prior to his current assignment, Maj Bueker served as a B-1 pilot, Air Liaison Officer and Joint Terminal Attack Controller. He holds a MAS in Military Operational Art and Science from Air University, and a BS in Management from the United States Air Force Academy.

Lt Col Anson Chiu is an Air Warfare Officer in the Republic of Singapore Air Force and joined the Department of International Security (DEI) in 2016, following his graduation from the Air Command and Staff College (in residence) program. Prior to joining Air Command and Staff College, he has served in a variety of staff and leadership appointments at the Squadron,
Operational Command, and at the Headquarters level. Anson graduated with a Bachelor of Engineering (Second Class Upper Honors) in Mechatronics from Nanyang Technological University, Singapore and has Masters Degree from Cranfield University, United Kingdom and Air Command and Staff College. In 2004, he was part of the Singapore's Joint Task Force and served as a liaison officer during the Tsunami Rescue and Relief Mission in Meulaboh, Indonesia.

**Dr. Dan Connelly** currently serves as Assistant Professor and Director of Instruction, Department of International Security. He holds a PhD in Educational Psychology from Auburn University, an MS from the Joint Military Intelligence College, an MA from American University, and BA from Trinity College in Russian Studies. During his doctoral matriculation he specialized in Organizational and Social Psychology. He offers elective courses in Russian strategic culture and the contemporary applications of the Just War Tradition. Dr. Connelly was assigned to Squadron Officer College in 2004, returned there as Dean in 2010, and was assigned to the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) in 2015 for his last military assignment before retirement from the US Air Force.

**Dr. Charles E. Costanzo** is an Associate Professor of International Security Studies at the Air Command and Staff College. A retired Air Force lieutenant colonel, Dr. Costanzo had assignments in ICBM operations, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and as a faculty member at the US Air Force Academy. His most recent co-authored article is “Busting Myths about Nuclear Deterrence.” Previous articles include “South Asia—Danger Ahead?,” an examination of potentially destabilizing military developments between India and Pakistan, and “What’s Wrong with Zero?” and “What’s Still Wrong with Zero?”, both critical assessments of the proposal to eliminate nuclear weapons from the US arsenal.

**Dr. Ronald Dains** currently serves as Chair, Department of International Security. He holds an MA and PhD in Political Science from the University of Alabama and an MAS in Aeronautical Science and BS in Professional Aeronautics from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University. During his doctoral matriculation he specialized in International Relations with minor fields of study in American Politics and Public Administration. His dissertation, Lasswell’s Garrison State Reconsidered: Exploring a Paradigm Shift in U.S.Civilian-Military Relations Research, explored the existence of plausible indicators to determine the potential for an increasingly influential military presence in the US policymaking process. He offers elective courses in US Civil-Military Relations and Logistics and the Use of Military Force. Dr. Dains was assigned to the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) from 2005 to his retirement in 2006.

**Dr. William Dean** is an Associate Professor of History at the Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell AFB, AL. He is a graduate of the University of the South (Sewanee) and received his doctorate and master’s degrees from the University of Chicago in European military and diplomatic history. He was a Chateaubriand recipient from the French government and has won the Military Officer of America Association (MOAA) award for civilian educator of the year and the Major General John Alison Award for Air Force Special Operations. He has published on French colonial warfare, intelligence, and air power issues in Revue Historique des Armées, Penser les Ailes Françaises, Defense Intelligence Review, and several chapters in various books.
Dr. Rob DiPrizio earned his PhD in Political Science from the University of Delaware in 2000 with a focus on international security studies and comparative politics. After a short stint at West Virginia University, he joined the faculty at ACSC. Dr. DiPrizio has held numerous leadership positions there and currently serves as an Associate Professor of International Security Studies in the Department of International Studies. He offers electives on contemporary warfare and Arab-Israeli conflict. He is the author of the book *Armed Humanitarians: US Interventions from Northern Iraq to Kosovo* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, August 2002) and is currently revising his manuscript America in the World Today which introduces readers to America’s most pressing international security concerns.

LCDR Sean Ferguson is an Instructor of International Security Studies at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), and he is a member of the International Security Studies course team. In addition to teaching core courses, he teaches in an elective on Small Wars. Prior to coming to ACSC, LCDR Ferguson served as Officer in Charge, Strategic Systems Programs Fleet Support Detachment where he trained and certified Pacific and Atlantic ballistic missile submarine crews in strategic weapon system operation. His previous tours include USS ASHEVILLE (SSN 758), Naval Nuclear Power Training Command, USS KENTUCKY (SSBN 737) (BLUE), and the Commander Submarine Force Pacific staff.

Lt Col Benjamin D. Forest is an instructor at Air Command and Staff College’s Department of International Security (DEI). During his 23-year Air Force officer and enlisted career, he has served in a variety of fields, including acquisition, cyberspace operations, recruiting, and contracting. He holds four masters degrees, including a Masters of Systems Engineering Management from the Naval Postgraduate School, and is a recent graduate of the Air War College (AWC) in-residence program at Maxwell AFB, AL. He has served in aircraft and satellite program offices, on the Air Staff, in Iraq and Afghanistan, and is a graduated squadron commander.

Lt Col Brant Fryar is an Instructor of Joint Warfare at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC). He is a former Reserve Assistance Officer (RAO) providing oversight to numerous Civil Air Patrol (CAP) units across TX and LA. Lt Col Fryar has also served as test manager and program manager in the acquisition career field (63A3) at Brooks AFB, Kelly AFB, Los Angeles AFB, and Hanscom AFB. Additionally, Lt Col Fryar was a Seminar Instructor at Academic Instructor School (AIS), Flight Commander at Squadron Officer School (AIS), and he served as Commandant of Cadets during an Air Force Reserve Officer’s Training Corps (AFROTC) assignment. Lt Col Fryar commissioned through the Air Force Reserve Officer’s Training Corps (AFROTC) at Texas Tech University in 1995. He has served 21 years, on both active duty and in the reserves.

Dr. Kelly Grieco is an assistant professor in the Department of International Security at the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC). She is also the Course Director for War Theory and teaches courses in war theory, international security, and military effectiveness. She holds a PhD in Political Science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where she was an affiliate of the Security Studies Program (SSP). She has held fellowships from the MIT Center for International Studies (CIS), the Smith Richardson Foundation, and the Tobin Project. Her research interests include coalition warfare, coalition military effectiveness, military strategy and
US force posture. She is currently working on a book manuscript on the sources of coalition battlefield effectiveness.

Lt Col Jennie "Tuzzi" Hall is an instructor in the Department of International Security. She is also currently the 21st STUS Commander. Lt Col Hall is an A-10 pilot by trade operating as a Sandy-1, Instructor Pilot, Evaluator Pilot and FAC(A). She holds an MA in Human Training and Performance Improvement from Capella University, an MA in Military Philosophy from the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, and a PhD in Political Science from The University of Georgia. Her fields of specialization include International Relations and Comparative Politics. Her research focuses on US foreign policy, foreign policy goals, decision-making, and organizational dynamics of foreign policy (i.e. NSC and DoD).

Dr. Mary Hampton is Professor of National Security at the Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell AFB. She was the Associate Dean for Academics at ACSC and has been Professor of National Security at ACSC since 2003. Prior to ACSC, Dr. Hampton was a Professor of Political Science at the University of Utah for 14 years, where she went immediately after receiving her PhD from UCLA. Her research focuses on International Relations Theory, European security, German security and foreign policy, women and German politics, issues and identity in trans-Atlantic relations, Russian foreign policy, the media and foreign policy, and US foreign and security policy.

Major Sarah K. Helms is an Air Command and Staff College AY17 graduate and serves as an instructor in Air Command and Staff College’s Department of International Security. Maj Helms is a USAF Test Pilot School, class 09A, graduate. She has held developmental engineer positions within AFRL and an Iraq deployment team supporting OIF, and flight test engineer positions at a variety of AFTC’s developmental test flight test squadrons. Prior to her tour at Air Command and Staff College, Maj Helms was the Director of Operations at the 746th Test Squadron and Central Inertial and GPS Test Facility. She holds an MS degree in Flight Test Engineering and an MAS degree in Military Operational Art and Science from Air University, an MS degree in Astronautical Engineering from the Air Force Institute of Technology, and a BS in Astronautical Engineering from the United States Air Force Academy.

Dr. Kevin C. Holzimmer is Professor of Comparative Military Studies at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC). Before his current position at ACSC, he was a research professor at the USAF Air Force Research Institute and taught at the School for Advanced Air and Space Studies. Dr. Holzimmer has published numerous studies on World War II in the Pacific, including General Walter Krueger: Unsung Hero of the Pacific War (University Press of Kansas). He is currently working on a book-length project that examines how the principal air, land, and sea commanders forged an effective joint team that successfully fought the Japanese in Douglas MacArthur’s Southwest Pacific Area. In addition to his academic pursuits, Dr. Holzimmer has worked on recent policy concerns, first with GEN David H. Petraeus’ USCENTCOM Joint Strategic Assessment Team (9 October 2008- February 2009) and most recently conducting fieldwork in charting a U.S. Air Force strategy based upon President Obama’s famous “pivot to Asia” speech. He holds a PhD in military history from Temple University.
Major Tenaya G. Humphrey is an Air Command and Staff College AY16 graduate with Higher Academic Distinction, and serves as an instructor/advisor in Air Command and Staff College’s Department of International Security. She is also the Deputy Course Director for War Theory, having previously served as the Course Director for the Gathering of Eagles elective, which preserves airpower legacies through research and interviews, and inspires future leaders through outreach initiatives. Prior to her tour at Air Command and Staff College, Maj Humphrey was a T-1 Evaluator Pilot and C-17 Instructor Pilot. She holds a MAS in Military Operational Art and Science from Air University, a MAS in Aeronautical Science, specializing in Human Factors from Embry-Riddle University, and a BS in Biology from the United States Air Force Academy.

Dr. Wes Hutto is Assistant Professor of International Security and Military Studies at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC). He is also the Course Director for International Security 1 and teaches courses in war theory, military strategy, US foreign policy, and regional security. His research interests include multinational military exercises as they relate to international and regional security dynamics, IR theory, and institutional processes in international politics. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Alabama. His recent publication “The Socialization of Military Power: Security Cooperation and Doctrine Development through Multinational Military Exercises” (coauthored with Derrick Frazier) is forthcoming in Defence Studies.

Dr. Robert M. Kerr is an associate professor in the Joint Warfighting Department at the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC). He also previously served as Course Director for International Security 2: The Use of Armed Force course. He holds a PhD in Political Geography from the University of Oregon, and an MA in Geosciences from the University of South Carolina. His BA is in History with an emphasis on the Islamic World from Grand Valley State University. In addition to teaching at ACSC, Dr. Kerr has worked at the Air Force Culture and Language Center, and taught courses at the US Air Force Special Operations School, the Senior NCOA Academy, and the Air Advisor Academy. In 2008-2009 he spent 15 months in NE Baghdad with the 3rd Brigade 4th Infantry Division and 1st Brigade 1st Cavalry Division as an embedded political/cultural advisor.

Lt Col Anthony Kim is an Instructor of International Security Studies at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), and co-instructor for Air University’s Homeland Security elective, which studies the changing course of National Security centering on ‘emergence’ or evolution of traditional national security as it relates to public safety. Lt Col Kim has participated in several AU, OSD and USAF wargames focused on Future Warfare and the role of ISR in multi-theater conflict. He is the former Reserve Advisor to the Curtis E. LeMay Center for Doctrine Development and Education responsible for the management and training of the Center’s assigned Intelligence reservists and was the program manager that designed and launched the Air Force Culture and Language Center’s Language Immersion Training Events currently used today. Lt Col Kim has taught extensively throughout Air University to include ROTC, OTS, SOS, ACSC distance learning and professional continuing education classes at the LeMay Center.

Dr. Michael Kraig is Associate Professor of International Security at Air Command and Staff College, Alabama. He earned his PhD in political science from the University at Buffalo, New
York, with a major in international security studies and a minor in comparative politics. Dr. Kraig served in several senior capacities with the Stanley Foundation, a non-profit, non-partisan NGO devoted to advocating security policy options for the United States and its competitors that would moderate the extremes of their geopolitical disagreements. He was a frequent traveler to Washington, DC, Europe, and the Middle East to give scholarly presentations to senior policy leaders, policy analysts, and academics. His publications include the book *Shaping U.S. Military Forces for the Asia Pacific: Lessons from Conflict Management in Past Great Power Eras*, by Rowman & Littlefield Press, and numerous articles on US-Iran relations, nuclear deterrence in the developing world between regional rivals, and military theory and its relation to US conventional force posture in East Asia, in the *Journal of Peace Research, India Review, Security Studies*, and *Strategic Studies Quarterly*.

**Dr. John T. LaSaine, Jr.** earned AB, AM, and PhD degrees in history from Brown University. His primary academic field is the history of United States foreign relations, with research and teaching interests including modern military history and political-military affairs. Dr. LaSaine has been an ACSC faculty member since 1997, serving as Vice-Dean for Academic Affairs (2003-06) and Chairman of the Department of Leadership and Strategy (2009-12). He has also taught at the University of Georgia, the Air War College, and the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies.

**Maj Matthew J. Mansell** is an Air Command and Staff College AY17 graduate and serves as an instructor/advisor in Air Command and Staff College’s Department of International Security. Prior to his tour at Air Command and Staff College, Maj Mansell was a KC-10 Evaluator Pilot and C-130 Instructor Pilot. He holds a MAS in Military Operational Art and Science from Air University, a MSOM in Operations Management from the University of Arkansas, and a BBA in Management from Baylor University.

**Lt Col John K. Martin** is an Instructor in the Joint Warfighting Department at Air University’s Air Command and Staff College. Lt Col Martin recently served as the MacDill Air Force Base Chief of Safety where he was responsible for the base safety program for 13,000 personnel. He was the Chief of Levant Strategic Plans and Executive Officer to the Director, Strategy, Plans, and Policy, United States Central Command. In this capacity he was responsible for developing long-range strategic planning for Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, Israel, and Cyprus. Additionally, he organized, planned, and coordinated executive matters and support for the two-star Director and seven one-star Deputies. Lt Col Martin has served in a variety of flying assignments, qualifying as an instructor pilot in the KC-135R and KC-10A. Lt Col Martin is a graduate of the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies and Air Mobility Command’s PHOENIX REACH and PHOENIX HAWK leadership development programs. His previous positions include assistant operations officer in Air Mobility Command’s largest operations support squadron, flight commander in two major weapon systems, headquarters aircrew analysis officer, and Tanker Airlift Control Center global operations director. Lt Col Martin is a command pilot with more than 2,500 flying hours including multiple combat deployments.

**Dr. Ann Mezzell** is an assistant professor in the Department of International Security. She is also the Course Director for International Security II. She holds an MA in political science from the University of Alabama and PhD in political science from the University of Georgia. Her
fields of specialization include international relations and comparative politics. Her research focuses on new wars, failed states, human security, humanitarian intervention, and peace enforcement. In addition to teaching the international security core courses, she offers an elective on the state and social contract theory.

Wg Cdr Rich Milburn currently serves as the UK Liaison Officer to ACSC and is an instructor in the Department of International Security. He is also the Deputy Course Director for International Security 1. He holds an LL.B from the University of Durham and an MSc from Kingston University London in Aerospace Systems. His Masters’ thesis was titled Advanced Radar and Infra-red Solutions for the Detection of Rockets, Artillery and Mortars. He graduated from ACSC AY16 with academic distinction. Milburn is an Aerospace Battle Manager, who has spent considerable time in tactical Air Command and Control posts, including a tour of duty in Iraq in 2003 and two tours of duty in Afghanistan in 2007 and 2010. More recently, Milburn was the Executive Officer of the UK Air C2 ISR Test and Evaluation (T&E) Squadron at RAF Waddington that is responsible for the T&E of multiple platforms including the Sentry E-3D, Sentinel R1 and the Airseeker Programme, as well as ground-based radar and tactical data links. His final assignment prior to being at Maxwell was as the Head of the Battle Management Branch at the NATO Deployable Air Command and Control System, Recognised Picture Production Centre and Sensor Fusion Post (DARS), part of NATO’s Deployable Air Command and Control Centre (DACCC).
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