Course Syllabus
American Security Policy
INR 6136
Summer 2018

Instructor Contact:

Instructor Roger Handberg
Office Phillips Hall 302
Office Hours 10-1130 MTW or by appointment (email for appointments)
Phone 407-823-2608
Email roger.handberg@ucf.edu

Overview:

American security policy was once considered relatively simple in that most thought of it largely in terms of overt military threats against the United States either foreign or domestic although economic warfare was recognized as possible, i.e. blockades and embargoes. The Civil War ended most of the concern about internal threats although questions of law and order continued in many parts of the United States. Suppression of the American Indians was considered a minor issue nationally given the growing disparity in numbers and firepower ultimately. The various actions taken regarding Native Americans constituted effectively the military experience for the United States until the Spanish American War in 1898.

By the 1880s, the U.S. was more conscious of its role in the world although isolationism remained a strong current in national politics but that now competed with those who felt the U.S. had a destiny in the world to match that of the great powers of Europe. However, the nation's physical isolation made such ventures unlikely although the United States had been active in various parts of the world when its interests were at stake including the pirates off the Barbary Coast of North Africa and the trade possibilities presented by the Western Pacific Rim (then known as the Far East even though it was west of the U.S.). U.S. natural resources and growing population guaranteed awareness of its military potential but national energy went into the opening of the Western United States and exploitation of the resources found there. For example, the United States was aware of warfare in

Europe but saw that as essentially not of interest. U.S. military observers went to witness the several wars leading up to the creation of modern Germany.

The Spanish-American War in 1898 introduced the United States to the world as an imperial power – a posture strenuously debated within American politics, never completely resolved. By the end of the war, the U.S. had acquired an empire in the Pacific and the Caribbean. The result was U.S. colonies with greater engagement in the politics of the various regions. The U.S. agreed to leave the Philippines in 1945 while U.S. forces withdrew from Cuba after the war (while retaining Guantanamo Bay as protection for the Panama Canal) but remained in Puerto Rico under a changed status as a U.S. territory. World War One placed the U.S. despite its wishes on the front lines of international security. After joining the Allies in defeating imperial Germany, the U.S. militarily largely withdrew back to the homeland. The U.S. remained internationally engaged on some issues such as naval treaties limiting the size of ships and fleets but rejecting membership in the League of Nations (helping insure its ultimate failure). The rise of aggressors in Europe and Asia saw the U.S. initially on the sideline for reasons of domestic politics and a sense of disengagement from world problems. One unanswerable question is whether the U.S. would have declared war on Germany after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in the absence of a German attack. Instead, Nazi Germany declared war on the United States resolving that question. Hitler apparently viewed the U.S. as only slowly impacting the outcome of the war – a miscalculation of the first order.

World War 2 did two things; it devastated most of the major powers and raised the U.S. to the peak of relative military power relative to all comers especially given its monopoly over nuclear weapons. On the ruins of Europe and Japan along with other damaged states such as China and the Soviet Union, the U.S. held most of the cards especially given the uncertainty about how many nuclear weapons the U.S. possessed after the two bombings of Japanese cities. In reality, effectively none but that information was closely held. During the war, the U.S. pushed for international forums to prevent the next world war (a reversal of views after World War One) – Europe was uncertain it could survive another such encounter. These organizations had the purpose of keeping the U.S. engaged in world problems rather than retreating back to Fortress America. Technology rendered such isolationism untenable in terms of national security. Through a long series of events, the situation resulted in a developed world largely split between adherents of the Soviet Union or the United States with the less developed world a forum for competition as the European empires collapsed and the imperial powers withdrew back to their homelands.

The resulting Cold War was the dominant international fact of life for nearly two generations. The terminology of a Cold War implied a struggle to the death but one in which the two super powers did not directly fight each other but rather operated through a series of surrogates. For the US, this played out in the Korea War, the Vietnam War, and a series of skirmishes in Asia, Africa and Central America. The fear was that direct super power conflict would escalate into nuclear conflict. Much effort both politically and intellectually went into maintaining a situation of continual conflict without raising the level of nuclear conflict. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989-1991 led to the peaceful end of the Cold War – truly a unique event when a major empire collapses without a war ensuing or as the result of some other catastrophic event. The fall of the Soviet Union though has been characterized by the current Russia president as 'The breakup of the Soviet Union was the greatest geopolitical tragedy of the 20th century.' Putin's actual quote may be somewhat different but the message is clear that Russia suffered greatly and his mission is to recover from that debacle, http://www.politifact.com/punditfact/statements/2014/mar/06/john-bolton/did-vladimir-putin-call-breakup-ussr-greatest-geop/. What all this means is that a globalizing world is becoming more diverse in terms of the threats that the national security apparatus and political leadership must address in real time. Threats come in traditional forms in terms of military forces and other elements of national power but more importantly the threats from non-state actors have moved to the fore along with the extension of national security threats into the realm of organized crime which operates internationally

Thus, this course on U.S. security policy looks much different from what was taught when I started teaching at UCF in 1972. There continues to be a military component but national security now encompasses explicitly areas that formerly were either not relevant or dealt with only by the private sector if they existed prior to the past 15 years. September 11, 2001 changed Americans' view of their personal security but what truly changed for the government and the military is how to respond to such threats especially as they morph into different areas. Efforts at ramping down the war in Afghanistan has placed the military in a strain because the war may be heating up again. The question is whether the US is now in the "forever war" some had feared after the attacks on the U.S. in 2001. The terminology used now was the "long war" but the implication is that the U.S. may be returning to a world not dissimilar in the sense of conflict to that of the "100 years war" earlier in Europe, http://www.history.com/topics/hundred-years-war. That conflict basically ended through exhaustion rather than a victory. The "long war" raises the same question, what is the end game? See Mark T Berger & Douglas A Borer (2007) The Long War: insurgency, counterinsurgency and

collapsing states, *Third World Quarterly*, 28:2, 197-215, DOI: 10.1080/01436590601153572 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436590601153572.

Policy makers now have to predict an environment that incorporates traditional style military threats such as the Russians and the Chinese while the more nebulous threats posted by cyber criminals whose actions may be more devastating than the military threats. More states develop the capacity to engage in cyber war each day, raising the difficulty of threat identification and response in real time. Nuclear proliferation remains an agenda item while biological weapons grow more potentially deadly as the technologies proliferate across the globe. The margin between benign and horrific in some areas is razor thin. Restructuring the national security apparatus including the military services becomes a US priority with little certainty about what the future looks like. The situation in the Ukraine and the persistence of ISIS demand attention while China continues its rise to what the Chinese see as their natural historical position as a world power.

Nations confront the necessity for conducting their foreign policies across a broad spectrum of issues by involving a variety of instruments. National security at the most general level means protecting the United States against all foreseeable threats not just military The spectrum of security threats ranges from economic coercion, cyber war to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) including biological, chemical and nuclear, and climate change. The latter is considered a real problem by the military in terms of generating future conflicts among states for scarce resources such as water and imparting operations. Environmental security has become an official concern of the Department of Defense (DoD) for more than a decade predating the Obama administration.

One major tool available in all states but Costa Rica is the military itself; an institution organized to inflict violence on behalf of the state across a wide diversity of contexts ranging from internal defense to nuclear holocaust. However, militaries due to their tight organizational cohesion and discipline have also been found by many states to be very useful for other purposes. Thus, militaries are employed for a wide range of purposes; some far removed from the context of war such as conducting humanitarian operations or completing social and economic improvements within the society itself also known as military operations other than war (MOOTW), see http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/pub1/appendix_e.pdf. One historical example is West Point in its original configuration – the academy produced many of the engineers who built the dams and railroads that assisted United States growth economically and geographically. That was a deliberate decision by the

academy's founders including President Thomas Jefferson who saw the possibilities of an institution that would meet both civilian and military needs.

In this course, we will explore these issues within the context of the United States. American security policy is a direct reflection of the desires and needs of the specific society it protects, a fact which makes it different from those goals sought by other societies but at the same time very similar. The differences relate to the individual societies and the values they represent. Because of its enormous coercive power, important issues exist regarding who controls the military and their likely obedience to the lawful authority. For many societies, the military becomes an independent political actor fully capable and willing to intervene in national politics. Military coups are part of the national politics such as in Turkey where the military previously intervened to protect what they saw as the secular nature of the state or in Egypt where the military successfully intervened in July 2013 to overthrow a democratically elected government. In Turkey in 2016, an attempted coup failed in dramatic fashion, **https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/12/turkey-failed-coup-attempt-161217032345594.html**.

American traditions, however, emphasize civilian control over the military, an issue that becomes more complicated as military technologies become more exotic, expensive and powerful. The separation between the military and the society it defends can prove to be a source of national weakness if the gap grows too wide. For example, General Douglas MacArthur was ordered to return to the United States from Korea in 1951 by President Harry Truman in a test of the civilian leadership's capacity to require military obedience. There were some who argued General MacArthur should resist what they saw as a "temporary political authority," temporary or not, in the American context obedience to a lawful order was the expectation which MacArthur fulfilled despite those calls for deliberate disobedience. MacArthur's willingness to comply reinforced an essential part of American military and political tradition unlike a number of states which fear possible military intervention into national politics and their refusal to obey civilian government directives.

As an instrument of American security policy, the American military has to adapt to changing domestic and international contexts, which either accentuate or depreciate the military's value within the society. Historically, American society has been very hostile to the military; seeing military service as a burden sometimes necessary but not the expected or desired norm. In our discussions, we will trace out the changes encountered by the military over the past century, a period during

which the United States entered fully onto the world stage despite strong desires to remain aloof from such entanglements (i.e., isolationism). This meant for example that the United States military did not shrink down to insignificance as it had after every previous war up until World War II. The Soviet threat was considered of such importance that the American military after WWII was rapidly expanded to first fight the Korea War starting in 1950 and then contend with the Soviet threat globally. With the Cold War's end in 1991, the military fully entered into a period of dramatic change in which the Soviet Union disappeared and the United States ascended to the status of the world's dominant military power.

This unipolar status is more tenuous than one might expect given the possibility of an ongoing Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA). The outcome of a RMA is by definition difficult to predict because the effect can be to destroy the technological dominance of the existing militaries. The United States is attempting to navigate between the shoals of excessive reliance upon obsolete technologies and the fantasies of super weapons that do not in fact work and may leave the United States more vulnerable than previously. That voyage takes us into the twenty first century and the brave new world of space operations and cyberwar. American security policy has entered a period of dramatic change in which old road markers are gone and the new are not yet in place. The threats are more diverse than ever as globalization takes form.

Course Goals: 1) Students will learn relevant perspectives and the analytic tools needed to understand American security policy, its historical and ideological foundations, policy processes and challenges. 2) Students will further their knowledge of key facts relevant to the study of American security policy. 3) Students will improve their writing, research and analytic skills.

Design of the Course:

This course is derived from an earlier face to face version of the course but has been adapted to the online environment. What that means is that students will be expected to participate in a series of discussions dealing with the readings and the research you are expected to produce in the context of the course. This is not a course in busy work where you generate something every day as you can see from the grade structure and module organization. Modules will be set up along with discussions to open every eight days or so through the course, this allows time enough to read the materials assigned and engage in informed discussion. Everyone must post in the first four days of their assigned discussion.

Individuals will be assigned specific articles which they will analyze and present to the class through a discussion that corresponds to the topic for which that article is assigned. Specific article assignments will be developed by Wednesday of the first week of class, there will be two or three per time interval. The first week will be two fold, asking you to provide a short paragraph identifying yourself in terms of program you are in, what your interest in U.S. security policy is, and what your goals are once you complete whatever degree program you are in presently. The schedule for the discussions is listed below and also in Module 1.

Discussions

1: May 14th-May 23rd, you must post your article analysis by May 19th

2. May 24st - June 1st, if assigned an article, you must post first by May 27th

3. June 2nd - June 9th, if assigned an article, you must post first by June 4th

4. June 10th - June 17th, if assigned an article, you must post first by June 12th

5. June 18th - June 25th, if assigned an article, you must post first by June 20th

6. June 26th - July 3rd, if assigned an article, you must post first by June 28th

7. July 4th - July 11th, if assigned an article, you must post first by July 6th

Grade Structure:

Grades are a product of several activities; most are based on your writing and analysis of different aspects of American security policy. Remember time frames are compressed this term so falling behind is not a viable option.
200 points - class discussion, article analyses - class discussions are 10 points first discussion, 20 points each of the rest, 35 points per article analysis
200 points –First Cut Strategic Threat Analysis– due June 1st
200 points – Second Cut Analysis of Capabilities General and Specific – due June 22nd
400 points –Third Cut Strategic Threat Analysis Specific – due July 11th

Late assignments are graded down ten percent a day, after 4 days, the grade becomes a zero for that assignment.

Grades in the course will be A, B, C, etc. with no plus or minus grades.

Academic Integrity:

Plagiarism and Cheating of any kind on an assignment will result at least in an "F" for that assignment (and may, depending on the severity of the case, lead to an "F" for the entire course) and offenders may be subject to appropriate referral to the Office of Student Conduct for further action. See the *UCF Golden Rule* for further information. I will assume for this course that you will adhere to the academic creed of this University and will maintain the highest standards of academic integrity. In other words, don't cheat by giving papers to others or taking them from anyone else. I will also adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity, so please do not ask me to change (or expect me to change) your grade illegitimately or to bend or break rules for one person that will not apply to everyone.

NOTE: All submissions must be done in MS Word format; otherwise, I am unable to open the document. This may lead to a delay in grading the materials while you resubmit the assignment. A second occurrence will result in a “zero” for the assignment. This restriction means no WordPerfect, MS Works or other word processing programs are accepted.

Readings:

So, the course will be moving fast – the readings only can hint at what is out there in terms of literature. We will deal with both academic and policy literature but there are other sources in the news media that may be relevant to your analysis. We have only 9 weeks total to scratch the surface. A series of articles and monographs provides the framework and content within which we will work. There is no text assigned for this course.

Communicating within the Course

In this class our official mode of communication outside class discussions is through email. For questions about specific class items or other information, you can contact me by email at roger.handberg@ ucf.edu. All communication between student and instructor and between student and student should be respectful and professional. You must also create and use a Knight's Email account at www.knightsemail.ucf.edu for separate official communications from the university. Under university policy, the instructor is prohibited from communicating official information about student performance except through Knight’s email (the email system is free).

Project Requirements including due dates:

The topics to be researched here include the threat environment the United States confronts over the immediate future and the options that appear to exist going forward. The course assumes you are familiar with the structure of the U.S. government and the national security establishment. The submissions will be completed in three stages labeled First Cut, Second Cut, and Final Cut.

The **First Cut (due June 1st)** involves your analysis of the **five** most critical national security threats confronting the US over the immediate future. You are to rank these specific threats in terms of severity of the challenges posed and then their probability of occurrence. Such an analysis requires that you provide some specifics as to what each threat means. Your analysis will be a **minimum of 1500 words with at least ten references that you have read**. Your analysis must be detailed, succinct and to the point. You turn in the First Cut through the course website. You must use the referencing system employed by the **American Political Science Review** which you can Google (the guide appears in a number of locations). References can be a selection of documents, reports, academic articles and books, and relevant news items (few of these). This First Cut is where you identify general threats and begin the task of honing in on the important threats that must be addressed. This is not a literature review per se but you need to be conscious of the reliability of the references you choose in terms of credibility, no fake news.

The **Second Cut (due June 22nd)** paper involves your assessment of U.S. capabilities in terms their applicability in dealing with those security threats. Remember the spectrum of potential threats is always broader than capabilities but states must make choices in how they will respond. This analysis should be informed by your initial analysis as to the actual threats. Do the threats and the capabilities match up or does the U.S. need to make major changes or increase in effort in order to deal with the environment you envisioned. The Second Cut will be a **minimum of 2000 words with at least 20 references germane to the analysis**. Your references are cumulative in that you can cite references identified in earlier paper.

The **Third Cut (due July 11th)** builds upon the two previous analyses, you are to identify and analyze the single most critical (1) national security threat the US faces over the next ten years. Your analysis must explain and justify your choice in terms of its credibility and likelihood. The second part of your analysis is to

develop what the US strategic response should be to defeat or ameliorate this specific serious threat. The document will be a **minimum of 3000 words with whatever references you feel support your analysis and recommendations. Late papers are graded down 10 percent a day.**

Schedule

Week of: Topic:

May 14- Course Introduction and Historical Context, Organizational Structure & Change – vertical and horizontal

May 24- Changing Tools, Volunteer Military, Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA), Special Operations

June 2- Complications: Failed States, Economic Challenges, Resource limitations,

June 10- Security Threats - Asia Pivot, Crimea, ISIS and Instability

June 18- Nonmilitary Threats & Vulnerabilities – Urbanization and poverty globally

June 26- Security Threats – Technology Driven, Drone, Weaponized Space, Cyber War, Ballistic Missiles

July 4 Security Threats – Natural, Disease Vectors, Climate Change