

**CENTER FOR HEMISPHERIC DEFENSE STUDIES
NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC 20319-5066**



Strategy and International Security (SIS-1202)

Revised Version, October 12, 2012

**Distributive-Learning I (DL-I)
Monday, September 17 – Friday, October 5, 2012**

**In-Residence
Monday, October 15 – Friday, November 2, 2012**

**Distributive Learning II (DL-II)
Monday, November 5, 2012 – Friday, January 4, 2013**

Dr. Scott D. Tollefson
Associate Professor of National Security Affairs
Course Director

Dr. Richard Downie
Director, CHDS

**Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies
National Defense University
Bldg 62, 300 5th Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20319-5066
Telephone: (202) 685-4670
Fax: (202) 685-4674
www.ndu.edu/chds**



DISCLAIMER

This document contains educational material designed exclusively to promote debate amongst participants in the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (CHDS) courses. It does not reflect the point of view of the National Defense University (NDU) or the United States Department of Defense (DoD).

CHDS COPYRIGHT NOTICE

The contents of this document are the property of the U.S. Government and are intended for the exclusive use of the faculty and students of the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies. No further dissemination is authorized without the express consent of CHDS.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies adheres to the National Defense University's Academic Freedom policy. This is defined as: Freedom to pursue and express ideas, opinions, and issues germane to the University's stated mission, free of limitations, restraints, or coercion by the University or external environment. Academic freedom is the hallmark of an academic institution. Students, professors, and researchers must be free to examine policy from all viewpoints. It is a combination of academic freedom and non-attribution that enables the development of such capabilities.

CHDS NON-ATTRIBUTION POLICY

Presentations by guest speakers, seminar leaders, students and panelists, including renowned public officials and scholars, constitute an important part of university academic curricula. To make it possible for guests, as well as faculty and other officials to speak candidly, the Center offers its assurance that their presentations at the courses, or before other CHDS-sponsored audiences, will be held in strict confidence.

This assurance derives from a policy of non-attribution that is morally binding on all who attend: without the express permission of the speaker, nothing said or presented will be attributed directly or indirectly in the presence of anyone who was not authorized to attend the lecture or presentation. However, references to the subject matter of the conversation can be made, without naming the author of said observations.

POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

This statement on academic integrity applies to all components of the National Defense University. The purpose of this broad university policy is to establish a clear statement for zero tolerance for academic dishonesty and to promote consistent treatment of similar cases across the University on academic integrity and the integrity of the institution. This document should not be interpreted to limit the authority of the University President or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This policy includes two key areas: academic integrity as it applies to students and participants at National Defense University; and academic integrity as it applies to assigned faculty and staff.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Academic dishonesty is not tolerated. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to: falsification of professional and academic credentials; obtaining or giving aid on an examination; having unauthorized prior knowledge of an examination; doing work or assisting another student to do work without prior authority; unauthorized collaboration; multiple submissions; and plagiarism.



- *Falsification of professional and academic credentials:* Students are required to provide accurate and documentable information on their educational and professional background. If a student is admitted to the University with false credentials, he or she will be sanctioned.
- *Unauthorized collaboration* is defined as students working together on an assignment for academic credit when such collaboration is not authorized in the syllabus or directed by the instructor.
- *Multiple submissions* are instances in which students submit papers or work (whole or multiple paragraphs) that were or are currently being submitted for academic credit at other institutions. Such work may not be submitted at the National Defense University without prior written approval by both the National Defense University professor/instructor and approval of the other institution.
- *Plagiarism* is the unauthorized use, intentional or unintentional, of intellectual work of another person without providing proper credit to the author. While most commonly associated with writing, all types of scholarly work, including computer code, speeches, slides, music, scientific data and analysis, and electronic publications are not to be plagiarized. Plagiarism may be more explicitly defined as:
 - Using another person's exact words without quotation marks and a footnote/endnote.
 - Paraphrasing another person's words without a footnote/endnote.
 - Using another person's ideas without giving credit by means of a footnote/endnote.
 - Using information from the web without giving credit by means of a footnote/endnote. (For example: If a student/professor/instructor/staff member enrolled or assigned to NDU copies a section of material from a source located on the internet (such as Wikipedia) into a paper/article/book, even if that material is not copyrighted, that section must be properly cited to show that the original material was not the student's).

SANCTIONS FOR VIOLATIONS OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Sanctions for violating the academic integrity standards include but are not limited to: disenrollment, suspension, denial or revocation of degrees or diplomas, a grade of no credit with a transcript notation of "academic dishonesty," rejection of the work submitted for credit, a letter of admonishment, or other administrative sanctions. Additionally, members of the United States military may be subject to non-judicial punishment or court-martial under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice.

PROCESSING OF POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The University is committed to establishing, maintaining, and enforcing a high level of academic integrity throughout the entire University community by implementing a very strict academic integrity policy. Cases in which a student is suspected of violating the academic integrity policy will be processed in accordance with the procedures set forth in the NDU Handbook, Section 5.12, entitled, "Student Disenrollment."

CHDS POLICY ON ATTENDANCE TO CLASSES AND ACTIVITIES

Participants have the responsibility to attend all activities and classes punctually. Please refrain from scheduling meetings, or accepting invitations to attend other activities, visits or appointments with diplomatic representatives from your country, friends or acquaintances during class times and any other time where your presence is required at the Center.



GRADING STANDARDS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THE CENTER FOR HEMISPHERIC DEFENSE STUDIES COURSES

I. Participants' Evaluations

CHDS applies several different mechanisms for evaluating a student's work including examinations, BOG contribution, and papers.¹

II. Grading Scale

Grade	Numerical Scale	Value
A+	100 – 97	Excellent
A	96.9 – 93	Very High
A-	92.9 – 90	High
B+	89.9 – 87	Above Average
B	86.9 – 83	Average
B-	82.9 – 80	Below Average
C+	79.9 – 77	Marginal
C	76.9 – 73	Passing
C-	72.9 – 70	Minimal Pass
F	69 or less	Failure
I		Incomplete

III. Examinations

Tests and quizzes will be administered to assess participants' ability to understand and analyze the readings and the topics discussed in plenary as well as in BOG sessions.

The following guidance will be applied:

Grade	Value
A+ (97-100)	Organized, coherent and well-written responses that completely address the questions, convey all applicable major and key minor points, and demonstrate total grasp of the topic.
A (96.9 – 93)	Answers address all major and key minor considerations, demonstrate excellent grasp of the topic.
A- (92.9 – 90)	Well-crafted answer that discusses important ideas related to the topic.
B+ (89.9 – 87)	Answers reflect average graduate graduate-level performance, successfully considering the topic of each question.
B (86.9 – 83)	Answers address the questions but fail to address all relevant concepts or to demonstrate a clear understanding of the topic.

¹ CHDS has adopted and adapted several standards used at CISA, the National War College and the Naval War College.



B- (82.9 – 80)	Cursory responses that do not fully address the questions or do not demonstrate clear understanding of the topic or relevant concepts.
C+ (79.9 – 77)	Answers demonstrate poor understanding of the topic, marginal support for arguments, and/or miss major analytical elements or concepts.
C (76.9 – 73)	Answers address the topic but do not provide sufficient discussion to demonstrate adequate understanding of the topic.
C- (72.9 – 70)	Answers address some of the ideas but response is incoherent.
F (69)	Insufficient

IV. Essay/Research Paper

The student's ability to gather information or to do research, to organize material logically, to compose and express thoughts in coherent and effective prose, and to use standard written language are crucial for paper content and composition. Submissions are to be typed (double-spaced) using 12-point Times New Roman. The following six elements are essential for a high-level paper:

1. It establishes the relevant question clearly;
2. It answers the question in a highly analytical manner;
3. It proposes a well-defined thesis, stated early on;
4. It presents evidence to support that thesis;
5. It addresses, explicitly or implicitly, opposing arguments or weaknesses in the thesis and supporting evidence (this constitutes a counterargument); and,
6. It accomplishes the above in a clear and well-organized fashion

The following guidance will be applied:

Grade	Value
A+ (97-100)	Offers a genuinely new understanding of the subject. Thesis is definitive and exceptionally well-supported, while counterarguments are addressed completely. Essay indicates brilliance.
A (96.9 – 93)	Work of superior quality that demonstrates a high degree of original, critical thought. Thesis is clearly articulated and focused, evidence is significant, consideration of arguments and counter-argument is comprehensive, and essay is very well-written.
A- (92.9 – 90)	A well-written, insightful essay that is above the average expected of graduate work. Thesis is clearly defined; evidence is relevant and purposeful, arguments and counter-argument are presented effectively.
B+ (89.9 – 87)	A well-executed essay that meets standards. A solid effort in which a thesis is articulated, the treatment of supporting evidence and counterargument has strong points, and the answer is well-presented and constructed.
B (86.9 – 83)	An essay that is a successful consideration of the topic and demonstrates average graduate performance. Thesis is stated and supported, counterarguments considered, and the essay is clear and organized.
B- (82.9 – 80)	Thesis is presented, but the evidence does not fully support it. The analysis and counterarguments are not fully developed and the essay may have structural
C+ (79.9 – 77)	The essay is generally missing one or more of the elements described above. The thesis may be vague or unclear, evidence may be inadequate, analysis may be incomplete, and/or the treatment of the counterargument may be deficient.
C (76.9 – 73)	While the essay might express an opinion, it makes inadequate use of evidence, has little coherent structure, is critically unclear, or lacks the quality of insight deemed sufficient to explore the issue at hand adequately.
C- (72.9 – 70)	Attempts to address the question and approaches a responsible opinion, but is



	conspicuously below graduate-level standards in several areas. The thesis may be poorly stated with minimal evidence or support and counterarguments may not be considered. Construction and development flaws further detract from the readability of the essay.
F (69)	Fails conspicuously to meet graduate-level standards. Essay has no thesis, significant flaws in respect to structure, grammar, and logic, and displays an apparent lack of effort to achieve the course requirements. Gross errors in construction and development detract from the readability of the essay
I	Incomplete

V. Contribution to BOG Sessions

The diversity of the student's body is one of the main features of CHDS courses. Students come from all countries of the hemisphere, with different professional and personal background, this unique characteristic tremendously enriches the discussion in the BOG sessions. Professor serving as facilitators, evaluate the contribution made by each student, assessing the quality of the student's input. The goal in assigning a classroom contribution grade is not to measure the number of times students have spoken, but how well they have understood the subject matter, enriched discussion, and contributed to their seminar colleagues' learning. This caliber of commitment entails that each student come prepared to take part in discussion by absorbing the readings, listening attentively to presentations, and thinking critically about both. Students are expected to prepare for and be thoughtfully engaged in each session. Not to contribute or to say very little in class undercuts the learning experience for everyone in the BOG. Differences of opinion should be conveyed with appropriate regard for the objective, academic, and professional environment fostered at CHDS BOG preparation and contribution will be graded at according to the following standards:

Grade	Value
A+ (97-100)	Contributions indicate brilliance through a wholly new understanding of the topic. Demonstrates exceptional preparation for each session as reflected in the quality of contributions to discussions. Strikes an outstanding balance of "listening" and "contributing." Respects fellow's ideas while challenging them when necessary.
A (96.9 – 93)	Contribution is always of superior quality. Unfailingly thinks through the issue at hand before comment. Can be relied upon to be prepared for every BOG session, and contributions are highlighted by insightful thought, understanding, and in part original interpretation of complex concepts. Ability to listen and comment fellow's ideas.
A- (92.9 – 90)	Fully engaged in seminar discussions and commands the respect of colleagues through the insightful quality of their contribution and ability to listen to and analyze.
B+ (89.9 – 87)	A positive contributor to seminar meetings who joins in most discussions and whose contributions reflect understanding of the material. Occasionally contributes original and well-developed insights.
B (86.9 – 83)	Average graduate level contribution. Involvement in discussions reflects adequate preparation for seminar with the occasional contribution of original and insightful thought, but may not adequately consider others' contributions.
B- (82.9 – 80)	Contributes, but sometimes speaks out without having thought through the issue well enough to marshal logical supporting evidence, address counterarguments, or present a structurally sound
C+ (79.9 – 77)	Sometimes contributes voluntarily, though more frequently needs to be encouraged to participate in discussions. Content to allow others to take the lead. Minimal



	preparation for seminar reflected in arguments lacking the support, structure or clarity to merit graduate credit.
C (76.9 – 73)	Contribution is marginal. Occasionally attempts to put forward a plausible opinion, but the inadequate use of evidence, incoherent logical structure, and a critically unclear quality of insight is insufficient to adequately examine the issue at hand. Usually content to let others form the seminar discussions.
C- (72.9 – 70)	Lack of contribution to seminar discussions reflects substandard preparation for sessions. Unable to articulate a responsible opinion. Sometimes displays a negative attitude.
F	Rarely prepared or engaged. Student demonstrates unacceptable preparation and fails to contribute in any substantive manner. May be extremely disruptive or uncooperative and completely unprepared for seminar

VI. Grade communication to the students.

Feedback will be substantive, constructive, and timely. Test and papers will be returned to the students.

1. Professors will inform in writing and via Blackboard all tests and papers grades, including comments that explain the given grade.
2. At the end of the course, professors will send to the Registrar, a complete list of all grades as well as the final Evaluation of Academic Performance of each student.
3. The Registrar will send the Evaluation of Academic Performance to each student.

VII. Challenging a Grade

CHDS recognizes that all participants in its courses are entitled to request a review of the grades received as a result of coursework. In cases of a challenge to a grade, the burden of proof rests with the student. In all cases where there is a reasonable doubt, the grade originally given will be retained. Requests for a change of grade will not be approved if the new grade results from additional work performed after the initial grade has been assigned.

The following process will take place when a student contests a grade:

1. No later than 15 days after receiving the grade, the student will request in writing an Explanation of his/her from the professor who assigned the grade. The professor, no later than 15 days after receiving the request, will respond to the request explaining the basis for the student's grade.
2. If the student believes that the explanation is still unsatisfactory, he/she will request to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Division of Education a Review of his/her grade. This request should be submitted no later than 15 days after receiving the Explanation. The student shall state the facts and must provide a clear and complete justification for the request.
3. After this communication, if the student still deems that the Review is not satisfactory, he/she is entitled to resort to a third and final instance by appealing the grade to the Dean of Academic Affairs, no later than 15 days after receiving the review. The Dean of Academic Affairs will convene a faculty committee of three CHDS professors who did not participate in the previous two review instances. Within 15 days of receiving the appeal, the committee will review all pertinent information relating to the case, which may include interviewing the instructor and student if necessary. The Dean of Academic Affairs, will communicate the results to the student thus bringing the process to an end. The decision of the Dean of Academic Affairs is final.



Course Introduction and General Description

This is a 14-week course, combining both on-line and in-residence activities to provide students a broad perspective on the subjects of strategy and international security in Latin America and the Caribbean. The program takes place across three phases.

Distance Phase:

During a three-week, on-line period, prospective participants will receive reading material – which they will be asked to analyze and evaluate. Simultaneously, they will be asked to prepare a research paper proposal. The evaluations of the reading analyses and the draft proposal will determine the student's eligibility to attend the resident phase of the course.

Resident Phase:

During a three-week resident phase at CHDS, approved participants will engage in an intensive program of lectures, conferences, seminars, case studies, debates, and readings. They will also have the opportunity to revise their original research proposal.

Writing Phase:

Following the resident phase, students will have eight weeks, also conducted on-line, and dedicated to the writing, perfecting, and delivery of their research paper.

Pre-Requisites:

As pre-requisites for the course, candidates must hold an accepted college degree and demonstrate an ability to read texts in English. Graduates of previous CHDS resident courses will receive priority. Those who are selected to attend will be asked to present a copy of all college transcripts, including a copy translated into English. These documents will be evaluated to confirm equivalence to a university degree and thus eligibility for the graduate-level credits. Selected participants will be given detailed instructions.

Reading Load:

Participants must be aware that they will be required to read approximately 120 pages per week during the pre-course phase, and approximately 70 pages per day during the in-residence phase of the course.

Course Goal: To deepen the participant's ability to analyze international relations, international security, and strategy, with a particular focus on security issues in Latin America.

Course Overview: To deepen the participant's understanding of strategic thinking in the context of international security. In so doing, participants will undertake an in-depth study of international relations and strategy, and apply the theory and levels of analysis to a security issue in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Course Objectives:

At the end of the course, students will be expected to:

- Understand and identify the major schools of thought and approaches to international relations, transnational relations, and world politics.
- Understand and identify both classical and contemporary schools of thought and approaches on strategy.
- Apply international relations theory and strategic thinking to a major security challenge in Latin America and the Caribbean.



Course Development/Methodology

A. Distance-Learning Phase (3 weeks)

Monday, September 17-Friday, October 5, 2012

The Distance phase of the course lasts three weeks and will be conducted via blackboard and via email between the professor and the students; communication will take place in English. The pre-course phase is designed to help the students acquire and/or refresh the theoretical knowledge necessary to participate effectively during the resident phase of the course, which will take place in Washington, D.C.

1. Paper Proposal

At the end of the Distance Phase, the students will present a paper proposal in English, Spanish, Portuguese, or French. The proposal must address a specific challenge related to security and/or defense in Latin America and the Caribbean, and must be approved by the professor. The paper, approximately 10-15 pages in length, must be completed no later than 9 weeks after the completion of the resident phase of the course, on Friday, January 4, 2013.

2. Policy Proposal Format

All research proposals will follow the format that is available in the first week's assignment folder on blackboard. A brief summarized format is given below:

- Research Proposal
- Bibliography
- Literature Review
- Methodology

It is important that you read the format document posted on Blackboard for further explanation. Poor research proposals will result in disqualification from attending the Resident Phase of the course. Students are therefore encouraged to start working on the proposal during the first week of the Distance Phase, and communicate regularly with the professor to make sure they are on the right track.

The paper proposal will not be graded, but will form the basis for the paper that is due at the end of the course. The final paper represents 40% of the final grade; therefore the proposal is extremely important.

B. Resident Phase (3 weeks)

Monday, October 15- Friday, November 2, 2012

The residence phase of the course will be conducted at CHDS. Students will be exposed to an in-depth treatment on theoretical and practical discussions regarding international relations and strategy. They will be challenged to analyze complex circumstances related to these themes. Methodology to help students acquire this knowledge will include required reading, lectures, conferences by experts and practitioners, seminars, and exercises. Themes will be distributed so that students develop a general understanding of the concepts and issues surrounding these phenomena. Particular emphasis will be placed on improving the ability of each participant to apply theory and levels of analysis to security issues.

During this phase students will be expected to take advantage of the National Defense University library and resources to continue the research and writing process on their papers. They will also be expected to take advantage of the presence of the professors to have one-on-one discussions to help guide and direct their research efforts.



1. Exercises

Students will participate in a number of evaluated exercises during the Resident Phase. The exercises will evaluate the participants' comprehension and analysis of the assigned readings, lectures, and discussions, utilizing an active application methodology. The students demonstrate their ability to effectively utilize the principal concepts in both individual and group activities, to include written and oral presentations.

2. Examinations

Students will be graded during the Resident Phase on the basis of one mid-course and one final examination. The examinations will evaluate the participants' comprehension and analysis of the assigned readings, lectures, and discussions. The examinations will consist of short-answer and/or essay questions.

C. Paper Writing Phase (8 weeks)

Monday, November 5 – Friday, January 4, 2012

After the in-residence phase, students will have 8 weeks to complete their research and conclude the paper. During this phase, they may receive on-line generic orientation and advice regarding the paper but should not expect reviews, editing, or proof-readings. Students may present their papers in English, Spanish, Portuguese, or French.

No paper will be accepted after the established deadline.

Course Grading

Grades will be ascribed according to the following distribution:

Research-paper proposal	Accepted (admission to Phase II)
Mid-course examination	20%
Participation throughout the course, including exercise performance	20%
Final course examination	20%
Research paper	40%



COURSE SCHEDULE AND READINGS

A. Distance Phase (on-line)

The distance phase of the course lasts three weeks and will be conducted via Blackboard and via email between the professor and the students; communication will take place in English. Each week emphasizes a distinct sub-theme of the course, and is oriented around a few key classic readings related to that theme. Students are responsible for completing all the assigned readings. The student's comprehension of the readings will be evaluated via email conversations with the professors, as well as threaded discussions between and among the other students in the class. Failure to participate effectively in the Distance Phase is grounds for non-admission to the Resident Phase of the course. The readings will be made available on-line via Blackboard.

Week 1: International Environment

Required Readings:

- Doyle, Michael W. "Liberalism and World Politics," in *American Political Science Review* 80, No. 4 (December 1986): 1151-69.
- Jervis, Robert. "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," in *World Politics* 30, No. 2 (January 1978): 167-214.
- Morgenthau, Hans. "A Realist Theory of International Politics," from *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (1949), chap. 3.
- Ruggie, John Gerard "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." In *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Edited by Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner (Cambridge, Mass., 1999), pages 215-245.
- Walt, Stephen M. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories," in *Foreign Policy*, no. 110 (Spring 1998), 29-44.

Complementary Readings:

- Keohane, Robert O.; Nye, Joseph S., Jr. "Introduction." In *Governance in a Globalizing World*, edited by Joseph S. Nye and John D. Donahue (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000), pages 1-38.
- Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is What States Make of It," *International Organization* 46 (Spring 1992), pages 391-425.

Week 2: Strategic Thought

Mandatory Readings:

- Gray, Colin S. "The Strategist as Hero." *Joint Force Quarterly*, no. 62 (3rd Quarter 2011): 37-45. <http://www.ndu.edu/press/strategist-as-hero.html>
- Strachan, Hew. *How is War directed? The Problem of Strategy*. Cambridge University Lecture on 3 February 2011. Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FHWyffZn5-c>



- Yarger, Harry R. *Strategic Theory for the 21 Century: The Little Book on Big Strategy* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, February 2006): all 89 pages. Available at: <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=641>

Complementary Readings:

- Betts, Richard K. 2000. "Is Strategy an Illusion?" *International Security* 25 (2): 5-50.
- Clausewitz, Carl. *On War*, Michael Howard and Peter Paret, editors and translators, Princeton University Press, 1984.
 - Book I – On the Nature of War, Chapter I, What is War?
 - Book II – On the Theory of War, Chapter III, Art or Science of War
 - Book III – Of Strategy in General, Chapter II, Elements of Strategy
- Nicholson, M. *Rationality and the Analysis of International Conflict*. Cambridge Studies in International Relations. Cambridge University Press. 1997. Part I - Conflict. pages 9-39. Part II Rational Behaviour, pages 43-100.

Week 3: Methodology and Paper Proposal

- Van Evera, Stephen. "Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A User's Guide," chapter 1 in *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997): pages 7-48.
- David Kaiser, *Writing Guide*. Pages 1-22.



B. In-Residence Phase

WEEK 1: THEORY & METHODOLOGY

The focus of the first week of the in-residence phase is the theory related to International Relations theory, International Security, Decision-Making, and Defense Policy Analysis. The course reviews research methodology and various frameworks that should guide the research and writing of the course paper.

Day 1: Introduction

- **Director's Welcome**
- **Course Overview**
- **Administrative Measures**

Course Introduction:

Goal: Provide an overview of the course and detail its in-residence phase.

Objectives:

- Participants will comprehend the rationale for the entire course vis-à-vis its generic and particular goals.
- Participants will understand and describe the particular requirements and the rationale of the “in-residence” phase.
- Participants will comprehend the logic which sustains the in-residence exercise requirements for the research proposal and paper.

Day 2: Theory and Methodology: A Framework for Analysis

These introductory lectures provide a mix of theory and methodology, with a practical framework of analysis for the course paper. They examine levels of analysis in international relations theory and the various approaches to strategic thought.

Goal: Provide tools and models for analyzing security issues within the context of international relations theory and strategic thought.

Objectives:

- Participants will comprehend the levels of analysis in international relations theory.
- Participants will be able to apply these levels of analysis in their research.
- Participants will understand the case study method.

Mandatory Readings:

1. Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Pp. 1-7.
2. Aquinas, Thomas. “Of War” Excerpted from *Summa Theologica*. Part II, Second Part
3. Axlerod, Robert. “The Evolution of Cooperation.” New York: Basic Books, 1984.



4. Bardach, Eugene. *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving* (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press/Sage, Third Edition, 2009): pages xv to 13.
5. Carr, E.H. "The Realist Critique" from *The Twenty-Years Crisis*.
6. Grotius, Hugo. "Prologemena to the Law of War and Peace." *The Law of War and Peace*. Trans. Francis W. Kesley. Carnegie Foundation for International Peace. 1925.
7. Hobbes, Thomas. "Of Commonwealth" pp. 223-229.
8. Horowitz, Donald L. "Structure and Strategy in Ethnic Conflict." Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics. Washington DC. April 20-21, 1998.
9. Kennan, George F. "Diplomacy in the Modern World." *American Diplomacy 1900-1958*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959. Pp. 95-103.
10. Keohane, Robert O. "International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work." *Foreign Policy*. Issue. 110. Spring 1998.
11. Locke, John. "Of the State of Nature." From *The Second Treatise*. Pp. 269-279.
12. Lukes, Steven. "Power: A Radical View." *Crossroads*. Vol. 6, No. 2. Pp. 87-95. 2006.
13. Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*.
14. Organsky, A.F.K., "The Power Transition." *World Politics*. New York: Knopf, 1958.
15. Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *The Social Contract*. pp. 49-63.
16. Thucydides. *The Melean Debate*.
17. Tzu, Sun. "On Assessments." *The Art of War*.
18. Van Evera, Stephen. "What Are Case Studies?" chapter 2 in *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997): pages 49-88.
19. Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System." *Comparative Studies of Society and History*. Vol. 16. No. 4. September 1974.
20. Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics* (Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1979), chapters 2 and 3.
21. Wilson, Woodrow. "The World Must be Made Safe for Democracy." Excerpted from Address to Congress. April 2, 1917.
22. Zinn, Howard. "Vacating the Premises in Vietnam." *Asian Survey*, Vol. 9, No. 11. November 1969. Pp. 862-867.

Complementary Readings:

- Brooks, Stephen G. and Wohlforth, William C. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Morrow, James D., Siverson, Randolph M. and Smith, Alastair. "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace," *American Political Science Review* 93 (December 1999), pp. 791-808.
- Detlef, Nolte. "How to compare regional powers: analytical concepts and research topics." *Review of International Studies*, 36, 2010. pp 881-901 Rasler, Karen A, and William R. Thompson. *Puzzles of the Democratic Peace: Theory, Geopolitics, and the Transformation of World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Lee Ray, James. "Integrating Levels of Analysis in World Politics," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 13 (4), 2001: 355-388.
- Mingst, Karen and Snyder, Jack. Eds. *Essential Readings in World Politics*. NY: W.W. Norton & Co., 2001.
- Rasler, Karen A, and Thompson, William R. *Puzzles of the Democratic Peace: Theory, Geopolitics, and the Transformation of World Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Russett, Bruce and Oneal, John. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001), ch. 1.
- Singer, J. David. "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations," *World Politics*, Vol 14, No. 1, October 1961, pages 77-92.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. *Man, the State, and War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965).
- Ward, Michael D. Randolph M. Siverson and Xun Cao, "Disputes, Democracies, and Dependencies: A Reexamination of the Kantian Peace", *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Jul., 2007), pp. 583-601.



Additional Readings in International Relations Theory:

- Carr, E. H. *International Relations Between the Two World Wars, 1919-1939*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Grieco, Joseph M. "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism." *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988): 485-507. [Reprinted in Oran R. Young, ed. *The International Political Economy and International Institutions Volume II*. Brookfield, Vermont: Edward Elgar Publishing Co., 1996, pages 311-33.]
- Jervis, Robert. "Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective," *World Politics*, Vol 61 (2008): 188-213.
- Kay, Sean. *Global Security in the Twenty-first Century: The Quest for Power and the Search for Peace* (Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., chapters 1 & 2 (pages 1-56).
- Katzenstein, Peter J. Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner, eds. *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999.
Keohane, Robert O. "Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond." In *Neorealism and Its Critics*. Edited by Robert O. Keohane. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986, pages 158 –203.
- Keohane, Robert O. "International Institutions: Two Approaches." *International Studies Quarterly* 32 (1988): 379-96. [Reprinted in Oran R. Young, ed., *The International Political Economy and International Institutions Volume I*. Brookfield, Vermont: Edward Elgar Publishing Co., 1996, pages 289-306.
- Mingst, Karen and Snyder, Jack. Eds. *Essential Lectures in World Politics*, Third Edition (New York & London: Norton, 2008). Chapter 4: "The International System". Selections by Hedley Bull, Hans Morgenthau, and Immanuel Wallerstein, pages 127-145.
- Mintzberg, Henry. *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*, New York: The Free Press, 1994.
Molander, Roger, Riddile, Andrew and Wilson, Peter. *Strategic Information Warfare: A New Face of War*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, MR-661-OSD, 1996.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. "Structural Realism after the Cold War," *International Security* Vol. 25, No. 1 (2000): 5-41.

Day 3: International Security: Latin America & the Caribbean

This lecture looks at the international security environment and its impact on Latin America and the Caribbean. It considers the various theaters in the international security arena, and the role of various actors.

Goal: To provide students with tools to apply international relations theories to security issues across the globe and to Latin America.

Objective:

- Participants should be able to analyze security issues in a global and regional perspective, and to identify key actors.

Mandatory Readings:

1. Institute for National Strategic Studies, *Global Strategic Assessment 2009: America's Security Role in a Changing World* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press." Chapters 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8.
2. Moses Naim. "The Five Wars of Globalization." *Foreign Policy*. January-February 2003.
3. R. Evan Ellis, "Latin American Outlook 2017. *Regional Insights*. No. 1. April 2012.



Complementary Readings:

- Battaglino Utdt, Jorge M. ¿Réquiem para la guerra en la Región Andina? Límites al conflicto en las relaciones entre Colombia y Venezuela. Revista SAAP [online]. 2009, vol.3, n.3, pp. 567-580.
- Bergman, Marcelo and Whitehead, Laurence. *Criminality, Public Security, and the Challenge to Democracy in América Latina*. Notre Dame, Kellogg Institute of International Studies, University of Notre Dame Press, 2009. Selected chapters.
- Buzan, Barry. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pages 261-341
- Fuchs, Ruth. *Hacia una Comunidad Regional de Seguridad?: Las Fuerzas Armadas en la Percepción de las Elites parlamentarias en Argentina, Brasil, Chile, Paraguay y Uruguay*. Rev. cienc. polít. (Santiago), 2006, vol.26, no.2, pp.29-52.
- R. Evan Ellis, "Maras: Diagnosing and Combating an Emergent Geopolitical Virus." University of Miami Center for Hemispheric Policy. August 1, 2008.
- Garcia, Jaime. "The Significance of Conventional Deterrence in América Latina," in *The International Library of Essays on Military History in Warfare in América Latina*, Vol II, Edited by Miguel Centeno, Princeton University, ASHGATE publication, 2007.
- Guardiola-Rivera, Oscar. *What if América Latina Ruled the World?: How the South will take the North Through the 21st Century*. Bloomsbury Press, 2010.
- Laurienti, Jerry. *The U.S. Military and Human Rights Promotion: Lessons from América Latina*. Praeger Security International. Praeger Press, 2007.
- Lopez-Calva, Luis Felipe and Lustig, Nora. Eds. *Declining Inequality in América Latina: A Decade of Progress?* Brookings Institution Press, 2010. Selected chapters.
- Ministerio de Defensa Nacional de Chile, *El Consejo de Defensa Suramericano de la Unasur Crónica de su Gestión*, Grupo de Trabajo del Consejo de Defensa Suramericano, Santiago de Chile, Julio de 2009.
- Moreira, Angela. Consejo Sudamericano de Defensa: Hacia una Integración Regional en Defensa, REDSAL, Diciembre 2008.
- Sicker, Martin. *The Geopolitics of Security in the Americas: Hemispheric Denial from Monroe to Clinton*. Praeger, 2001. Electronic book. Selected chapters.
- Tulchin, Joseph S.; Fruhling, H. Hugo; Golding, Heather. Eds. *Crime and Violence in América Latina: Citizen Security, Democracy, and the State*. Washington: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Vanden, Harry E.; Prevost, Gary. *Politics of América Latina: The Power Game*. Oxford University Press, 2008. Chapter case studies of: Guatemala, Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, Nicaragua, and Bolivia.
- Varas, Augusto. "New Power Relations in América Latina and their Global Influence," Report of the conference co-sponsored by the Norwegian Peacebuilding Centre and Universidad de los Andes, held in Bogota, Colombia, 28 October 2009, pages 1-22.

Day 4: Security in Latin America: Decision-Making

Goal: Be able to apply concepts in international security and strategic thinking to current security issues in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Objectives:

- Be familiar with theories of international security and strategy.
- Be familiar with theories concerning decision-making related to national security.



- Apply theories of international security and strategic thinking to specific cases in Latin America

Mandatory Readings:

1. Vandenbroucke, Lucken S. Anatomy of a Failure: The Decision to Land at the Bay of Pigs." *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 99:3, Fall 1984. Pages 471-491.
2. De Santibañes, Francisco. The Effectiveness of Military Governments during War: The Case of Argentina in the Malvinas," *Armed Forces and Society*, Volume 33:4. July 2007. Pages 612-637.
3. Allison, Graham T. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol 63, 3, 1969.

Complementary Reading:

- Arceneaux, Craig; Pion-Berlin, David. *Transforming América Latina: The International and Domestic Origins of Change* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005): chapter 6, "Regional Security in Central America," pages 156-186.
- Silva, Patricio. "Epilogue: Violence and the Quest for Order in Contemporary América Latina," chapter 12 in Kees Koonings and Dirk Kruijt, editors, *Armed Actors: Organized Violence and State Failure in América Latina* (London, New York: Zed Books, 2004): pages 186-191.
- Solís Rivera, Luis Guillermo. "Central America: Integration, Security and the Crisis in the Regional System," in Moufida Goucha and Francisco Rojas Aravena, *Human Security, Conflict Prevention and Peace in América Latina and the Caribe* (UNESCO-FLACSO/Chile, 2003): pages 115-126.
- Trinkunas, Harold. "Venezuela: The Remilitarization of Politics," chapter 7 in Kees Koonings and Dirk Kruijt, editors, *Armed Actors: Organized Violence and State Failure in América Latina* (London, New York: Zed Books, 2004): pages 106-126.
- Vanden, Harry E.; Prevost, Gary. *Politics of América Latina: The Power Game*. Oxford University Press, 2008. Case Studies of Guatemala (Susanne Jonas) and Nicaragua (Gary Prevost and Harry E. Vanden).

Day 5: Defense Policy Analysis

This lecture examines defense policy analysis and the methods for such analysis.

Goal: Apply defense policy analysis methods to Latin America and the Caribbean.

Objectives:

- Identify some of the methods of policy analysis, and how they can be applied to the defense arena.
- Apply defense policy analytical tools to Latin America.

Mandatory Reading:

1. Kugler, Richard L., *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era*, chapters 2-4, pages 11-60.

Complementary Reading:

- Kugler, Richard L., *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era* (Entire book)



WEEK 2: STRATEGY

The focus of the second week of the in-residence phase is strategy, at all levels, and applied to Latin America. It reviews classical strategic thought, and moves to more contemporary strategic thinkers and to various levels of strategy. The course then applies strategic thinking to Mexico, the United States, and the Caribbean. In applying this theory in their papers, participants should be explicit in their utilization of a level (or various levels) of strategy.

Day 6: External Actors & Latin America

Goal: Be able to apply concepts in international security and strategic thinking to current security issues in the Western Hemisphere; and to recognize external actors in Latin America.

Objectives:

- Be familiar with theories of international security and strategy.
- Apply theories of international security and strategic thinking to external actors in Latin America (such as the People's Republic of China).

Mandatory Readings:

1. Evan Ellis, "Beyond "Win-Win" and the Menacing Dragon: How China is Transforming Latin America." Center for Hemispheric Policy Working Paper. Forthcoming. 2012.
2. R. Evan Ellis, "China – Latin America Military Engagement: Good Will, Good Business, and Strategic Positioning." Air and Space Power Journal en Espanol. Air & Space Power Journal en Espanol. 2nd Trimester 2012. Pp. 43-56.
3. R. Evan Ellis, "Organized Crime Exploits China's Growing Links to Latin America" China Brief. Vol. 8. No. 11. May 25, 2012.
4. R. Evan Ellis, "Chinese Soft Power in Latin America: A Case Study." Joint Forces Quarterly. Issue 60. 1st Quarter 2011. Pp. 85-91.
5. R. Evan Ellis, "Emerging Multipower Competitions in Latin America." Air & Space Power Journal en Espanol. Vol. 3. No. 1. 1st Trimester 2011. Pp. 16-25.
6. R. Evan Ellis, "The Expanding Chinese Footprint in Latin America: New Challenges for China, and Dilemmas for the US". French Institute of International Relations (IFRI). No. 49. http://www.ifri.org/?page=contribution-detail&id=7014&id_provenance=88&provenance_context_id=2&lang=uk. February 2012.

Complementary Readings:

- R. Evan Ellis, "New Frontiers? China-Latin America Space Cooperation", Security and Defense Studies Review. Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies. Vol. 10. January-June 2010. Pp. 123-130.

Day 7: Thinking About Strategy

Goal: To link the notion of "strategy" to real challenges facing Latin America and the Caribbean today.

Objectives:

- Comprehend various definitions and facets of strategy.
- Develop criteria to determine how strategy may (or may not) relate to security issues in Latin America and the Caribbean.



Mandatory Readings:

1. "The 27 Articles of T. E. Lawrence," *The Arab Bulletin*, August 20, 1917. 6 pages.
<http://www.usma.edu/dmi/IWmsgs/The27ArticlesofT.E.Lawrence.pdf>
2. Guedes da Costa, Thomaz "The Teaching of Strategy; Lykke's Balance, Schelling's Exploitation, and a Community of Practice in Strategic Thinking," chapter 8 in Gabriel Marcella, editor, *Teaching Strategy: Challenge and Response* (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2010) pages 203-240.
<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=976>
3. Gray, Robert C. "The Study of Strategy: A Civilian Academic Perspective," chapter 3 in Gabriel Marcella, editor, *Teaching Strategy: Challenge and Response* (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2010), pages 47-77.
<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=976>

Complementary Reading:

- Betts, Richard K. "Is Strategy an Illusion?" in *International Security*, Volume 25, No. 2 (Fall 2000), pages 5-50.
- Marcella, Gabriel. editor, *Teaching Strategy: Challenge and Response*, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2010.

Day 8: Strategic Thought

This lecture analyzes the theoretical underpinnings of strategy, and links the concepts of policy, strategy, and national security. This lecture establishes the foundation to understand the context in which strategies are developed. It moves beyond the broad discussion of strategy at the conceptual level to a more operational treatment of how to convert "grand strategy" into specific governmental strategies and policies.

Goal: To provide students with a keen understanding of the complexity involved with the subject of strategy.

Objectives:

- Participants should be able to identify various approaches to strategic thought.
- Participants will comprehend the various levels of strategy.
- Participants will analyze the strengths and weaknesses of grand strategic thought.
- Participants will seek to apply grand strategy to an analysis of Latin America.

Mandatory Readings:

1. Luttwak, E. N. *Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 2003. Part I (The Logic of Strategy), Part II (The Levels of Strategy). Pages 3-31;87-137.
2. Murray, W.; Grimsley, M. "Introduction: On Strategy" in W Murray, et. al. (ed.). *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States, and War*. Cambridge University Press. 1995. Pages 1-23.
3. Lykke, Arthur F., Jr. Defining Military Strategy, *Military Review*, January-February 1997, pages 1-5.
4. Van Creveld, Martin. *The Transformation of War*, pages 1-18.



Complementary Reading:

- Garcia, Jaime. "The Significance of Conventional Deterrence in Latin America," in *The International Library of Essays on Military History in Warfare in Latin America*, Vol II, Edited by Miguel Centeno, Princeton University, ASHGATE publication, 2007.
- Paret, Peter. Editor. *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).
- Buzan, Barry. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge University Press, 2003: 40-91.

Day 9: National Security Strategy: Case Study of Mexico

Goal: Be able to apply concepts in international security and strategic thinking to current security issues in Mexico.

Objectives:

- Be familiar with theories of international security and strategy.
- Apply theories of international security and strategic thinking to security issues in Mexico.

Mandatory Readings:

1. Ribando Seelke, Clare; Finklea, Kristin M. U.S.-Mexican Security Cooperation: The Merida Initiative and Beyond (U.S. Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, Report 7-5700, R41349, July 29, 2010): 39 pages.
2. Ai Camp, Roderic. *Armed Forces and Drugs: Public Perceptions and Institutional Challenges*, Working Paper Series on U.S.-Mexico Security Collaboration, Wilson Center for Scholars/Mexico Institute and University of San Diego, Trans-Border Institute, May 2010, 33 pages.

Complementary Reading:

- Richard D. Downie, Critical Strategic Decisions in Mexico: The Future of U.S.-Mexican Defense Relations, CHDS Occasional Paper, Strategic Issues in U.S.-Latin American Relations, Volume 1, Number 1, July 2011. 35 pages.
- Brands, Hal. Mexico's Narco-Insurgency and U.S. Counterdrug Policy (U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2009): 67 pages.
- Council of Foreign Relations, *Moving Beyond Merida in U.S.-Mexico Security Cooperation*, Prepared statement by Shannon O'Neil before the Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere; and Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism, United States House of Representatives, 111th Congress, 2nd session, Hearing on "U.S.-Mexico Security Cooperation: Next Steps for the Merida Initiative," ThursDía, May 27, 2010. 9 pages.
- Grayson, George W. *Mexico: Narco-Violence and a Failed State?* (Transaction, 2009).
- Olson, Eric L.; Wilson, Christopher E. *Beyond Merida: The Evolving Approach to Security Cooperation*, Working Paper Series on U.S.-Mexico Security Collaboration, Wilson Center for Scholars/Mexico Institute and University of San Diego, Trans-Border Institute, May 2010, 8 pages.
- Vandklen, Harry E.; Prevost, Gary. *Politics of Latin America: The Power Game* (Oxford University Press, 2008). Chapter on Mexico, by Nora Hamilton



Day 10: National Security Strategy: Case Studies of USA and the Caribbean

Goal: Examine strategy at the nation-state level, with a focus on the Americas.

Objective:

- Assess the national security strategy of the United States.

Mandatory Reading:

1. Kugler, Richard L. *New Directions in U.S. National Security Strategy, Defense Plans, and Diplomacy: A Review of Official Strategic Documents* (Institute for National Strategic Studies, Center for Technology and National Security Policy, 2011), 159 pages.
2. United States Senate, *Preventing A Security Crisis in the Caribbean*, A Report by the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, Washington, D.C., September 2012. 40 pages. **
3. Western Hemisphere Defense Policy Statement
 - a. English version --<http://www.defense.gov/news/WHDPS-English.pdf>
 - b. Spanish version--<http://www.defense.gov/news/WHDPS-Spanish.pdf>

Complementary Readings:

- Allison, Graham T. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol 63, 3, 1969
- Art, Robert J. *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003), especially chapters 1-3.
- Bush, George W. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (The White House, September 2002).
- Gates, Robert M. "A Balanced Strategy: Reprogramming the Pentagon for a New Age," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2009.
- Lempert, Robert J.; Groves, David G.; Popper, Steven W.; Bankes, Steve C. *A General, Analytic Method for Generating Robust Strategies and Narrative Scenarios*. Management Science Online. 2006.
- Obama, Barack Hussein. *National Security Strategy* (The White House, May 2010), pages 1-52.
 - http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf
- Ringland, Gill. *Scenario Planning: Managing for the Future*. Wiley. NY. 1998. Chapter 6 – Scenarios to Influence Public Attitude.
- Rojas Aravena, Francisco. "Human Security: Emerging Concept of Security in the Twenty-First Century," chapter 1 in Moufida Goucha and Aravena, editors, *Human Security, Conflict Prevention and Peace in América Latina and the Caribbean* (UNESCO-FLACSO/Chile, 2003): pages 11-25.
- Tickner, Arlene B. "Latin America and the Caribbean: Domestic and Transnational Insecurity," in the *Coping with Crisis Working Paper Series*, International Peace Academy, February 2007, pages 1-13.
- Tulchin, Joseph S.; Espach, Ralph H. Eds. *Latin America in the New International System* (Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001), pages 1-72; 215-222.
- Brasil, *Estrategia de Nacional de Defesa*, Brasília: Ministério da Defesa, 2008.
- Chile, *Libro de la defensa Nacional de Chile 2010*, Santiago: Ministerio de Defensa Nacional, 2010.
- Guatemala, *Libro de la Defensa Nacional de la República de Guatemala*, Ciudad de



NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR HEMISPHERIC DEFENSE STUDIES



- Guatemala: Ministerio de la Defensa Nacional, 2001
- El Salvador, *Libro de la Defensa Nacional*, San Salvador: República de San Salvador. 2006



WEEK 3: IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGY

During the final week in residence, the focus will be on the application of theory (international relations, international security and strategy) to security issues in Latin America and the Caribbean. Each student will have the opportunity to present their current findings for the research paper. Each student will receive feedback from colleagues and from the instructor on that research. This feedback is meant to help the student in the final phase of the course: the writing of the research paper.

Day 11: Strategy: A Comparative Framework

Goal: Examine strategy comparatively and globally.

Objectives:

- Identify methodological tools for strategic analysis in a comparative framework.
- Apply the Ospina “J” curve to various case studies.

Mandatory Reading:

1. Ospina, Carlos with Thomas A Marks. “Changing Strategy Amidst the Struggle: The Colombian Case as a Success Story.” Draft, 1 September 2011. 22 pages.

Day 12: Security Issues in Latin America: Central America; Venezuela

Goal: Be able to apply concepts in international security and strategic thinking to current security issues in the Western Hemisphere; and to recognize external actors in Latin America.

Objectives:

- Be familiar with theories of international security and strategy.
- Apply theories of international security and strategic thinking to security issues in Central America and Venezuela

Mandatory Readings:

1. Meyer, Peter J. and Clare Ribando Seelke. *Central America Regional Security Initiative: Background and Policy Issues for Congress*. Congressional Research Service, CRS Report for Congress, March 30, 2011, 35 pages. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41731.pdf>

Complementary Readings:

- Dudley, Steven S. *Drug Trafficking Organizations in Central America: Transportistas, Mexican Cartels and Maras*, Working Paper Series on U.S.-Mexico Security Collaboration, Wilson Center for Scholars/Mexico Institute and University of San Diego, Trans-Border Institute, May 2010, 30 pages.
- Ellis, R. Evan. “Venezuela’s Relationship with China: Implications for the Chávez Regime and the Region,” paper published by University of Miami, Center for Hemispheric Policy, August 18, 2010. 12 pages.



- Kirk, Robin. *More Terrible Than Death: Drugs, Violence, and America's War in Colombia*. (Public Affairs: 2004).
- Manwaring, Max G. *Contemporary Challenge to State Sovereignty: Gangs and Other Illicit Transnational Criminal Organizations (TCOs) in Central America, El Salvador, Mexico, Jamaica, and Brazil* (U.S. War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2008): 66 pages.
- Savenije, Wim; Van der Borgh, Chris. "Youth Gangs, Social Exclusion and the Transformation of Violence in El Salvador," chapter 10 in Kees Koonings and Dirk Kruijt, editors, *Armed Actors: Organized Violence and State Failure in América Latina* (London, New York: Zed Books, 2004): pages 155-171.
- Tickner, Arlene B.; Mason, Ann C. "The Andean Region Human Security Dynamic," in Moufida Goucha and Francisco Rojas Aravena, *Human Security, Conflict Prevention and Peace in América Latina and the Caribe* (UNESCO-FLACSO/Chile, 2003): pages 127-140.
- U.S. Agency for International Development, *Assessment of the Implementation of the United States Government's Support for Plan Colombia's Illicit Crop Reduction Components*, April 17, 2009. Pages 1-55.
- Vanden, Harry E.; Prevost, Gary. *Politics of América Latina: The Power Game*. Oxford University Press, 2008. Case Studies of Venezuela (Daniel Hellinger), Colombia (John C. Dugas), and Bolivia (Waltraud Morales).
- Vellinga, Menno. "Violence as Market Strategy in Drug Trafficking: The Andean Experience," chapter 5 in Kees Koonings and Dirk Kruijt, editors, *Armed Actors: Organized Violence and State Failure in América Latina* (London, New York: Zed Books, 2004): pages 73-86.

Day 13: Security Issues in Latin America: Colombia; Argentina

Goal: Be able to apply concepts in international security and strategic thinking to current security issues in South America.

Objectives:

- Be familiar with theories of international security and strategy.
- Apply theories of international security and strategic thinking to security issues in Colombia and Argentina.

Mandatory Readings:

1. David E. Spencer, *Lessons from Colombia's Road to Recovery, 1982-2010*. CHDS Occasional Paper, Volume 2, Number 1, May 2012, 43 pages. **
2. Argentina, Ministerio de Defensa – Política internacional de Defensa
http://www.mindef.gov.ar/mindef_politica_inter_defensa/index.php#
3. Argentina, Ministerio de Defensa – Política Nacional de la Defensa
http://www.mindef.gov.ar/institucional/politica_nacional_de_la_defensa/index.php

Complementary Readings:

- David E. Spencer, et al. *Colombia's Road to Recovery: Security and Governance 1982-2010*, Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies, National Defense University, June 17, 2011. 126 pages.
- Arbelaez Arango, Alejandro. "La Política Colombiana de Seguridad Democrática, 2002-2010.
- Ivan Duque Márquez, Seguridad y transformación social : Una visión a la estrategia de Desarrollo da la Administración Uribe en la historia reciente de Colombia.



- Apertura del 129 período de sesiones ordinarias del Congreso Nacional: Discurso de la presidenta Cristina Fernández <http://www.presidencia.gov.ar/discursos/6212-apertura-del-129-periodo-de-sesiones-ordinarias-del-congreso-nacional-discurso-de-la-presidenta-cristina-fernandez>
- Argentina, Ministerio de Defensa – Decreto 1714/2009 – Directiva de Política de Defensa Nacional. <http://www.resdal.org/ultimos-documentos/decreto-1714.pdf>

Day 14: Security Issues in Latin America: Brazil; Chile; + Course Review

Goal: Be able to apply concepts in international security and strategic thinking to current security issues in South America.

To review the major points of the course, and to evaluate the learning of the students

Objectives:

- Be familiar with theories of international security and strategy.
- Apply theories of international security and strategic thinking to security issues in Brazil and Chile.
- Present research findings to date.

Mandatory Readings:

1. Brands, Hal. *Dilemmas of Brazilian Grand Strategy* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, August 31, 2010).

Complementary Readings:

- Bertonha, João Fábio. "Brazil: An Emerging Military Power? The Problem of the Use of Force in Brazilian International Relations in the 21st Century." *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 53.2 (2010): 107-24. <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbpi/v53n2/06.pdf>
- Guedes da Costa, Thomaz. "Strategies for Global Insertion: Brazil and Its Regional Partners," chapter 4 in Joseph S. Tulchin & Ralph H. Espach, editors, *Latin America in the New International System* (Boulder, Colorado and London: Lynne Rienner, 2001), pages 91-116.
- Oelsner, Andrea. "International Relations in Latin America: Peace and Security in the Southern Cone" (Routledge, 2009).
- Tollefson, Scott D. "Brazil: The Emergence of a Regional Power," in Jeffrey S. Lantis, Juliet Kaarbo, and Michael T. Snarr, editors, *Foreign Policy in a Comparative Perspective: Domestic and International Influences on State Behavior* (CQ Press, 2001), pages 283-301.
- Vanden, Harry E.; Prevost, Gary. *Politics of Latin America: The Power Game*. Oxford University Press, 2008. Case Studies of: Brazil (Wilber Albert Chaffee), Argentina (Aldo C. Vacs), and Chile (Eduardo Silva).

Day 15: Course Wrap Up

Goal: To finalize the course.

Objectives:

- Conduct final review
- Conduct final counseling for research paper preparation.



- Conduct end-of-course ceremony

C. Writing Phase

Recommend that you turn in the final draft of your paper on Friday, December 7, 2012.

Final draft of paper is due no later than **Friday, January 4, 2013.**