

**THE FLETCHER SCHOOL OF LAW AND DIPLOMACY
TUFTS UNIVERSITY**

Professor William C. Martel Office Hours: Cabot 602, 2-3pm and by appointment Email: William.Martel@Tufts.edu	DHP 205 Summer 2009 MW 3:30-6:30
--	---

DECISION MAKING AND PUBLIC POLICY

It is necessary for all governments and organizations, large and small, to develop and implement decision making processes that permit policymakers to make informed decisions about a range of highly complex issues and problems. While there are differences in how governments and organizations are organized to perform this function, there are several fundamental components that determine how effectively these organizations respond to problems. This course focuses on the nature and mechanisms of governmental and organizational decision making and interagency processes. It begins by examining the nature of decision making, and then considers the domestic and international sources of influence on decision making. The course then examines the interagency process, including the nature of the U.S. National Security Council, and various interpretive models which are used to understand the constraints on individuals who operate in a bureaucratic environment. Finally, the course concludes with an exercise in which students will present and defend a policy memorandum in a simulated meeting of the U.S. National Security Council. In this meeting, the students will play the role of NSC principals who will present their positions for a decision by the president.

Thus, this course outlines the sources of influence on policy, perspectives on decision making, the structure and conduct of the interagency process, and gives students the opportunity to develop and refine their policy memorandum writing skills. In addition, this course will use a series of case studies from the field of security studies to examine critically the theoretical and practical problems that influence how governments and private sector firms make decisions.

Policy Memoranda

Since a critical skill in governments and private sector firms is the ability to analyze and express solutions to complex problems in succinct and precise terms, this course will give the student the opportunity to develop and refine their policy memoranda writing skills. The student will be required to write three 3-page (single-spaced) policy memoranda: two policy memoranda will be on topics of the student's choice and as discussed with Professor Martel. The third policy memorandum will be prepared in preparation for the NSC meetings in which each student will participate as a cabinet-level "principal."

When organizing your policy memoranda, a useful approach is to frame these in terms of the central problem or issue in your field of interest. When writing these memos, I urge you to think of how you would inform a decision maker about a problem: what is the central issue, how should he or she think about the problem, what framework is most helpful in understanding the problem, how critical is it to resolve the problem, and what specific options and recommendations would you pose? My own view is that the most fundamental output of your policy memos should be to give decision makers a coherent way to think about a problem and the specific options that are available to them for resolving the problem.

EVALUATION

Your grade will be based on the following:

- Policy Memorandum #1 40%
- Policy Memorandum #2 40%
- Participation (Class and Simulation) 20%

WEEKLY SCHEDULE

Week	Topic	Case Study
Day 1	Introduction to Decision Making and Public Policy	Proliferation of WMD
Day 2	Influences on Decision Making: International Political	Terrorism
Day 3	Influences on Decision Making: Domestic Political	Ballistic Missile Defense
Day 4	Analytical Perspectives: An Introduction and Case Study	Energy Vulnerabilities
Day 5	Decision Making Perspectives: Rational Actor Model	Cyber Security
Day 6	Decision Making Perspectives: Organizational Behavior Model	Role of Intelligence
Day 7	Decision Making Perspectives: Government Politics Model	Pandemics and Global Contagion
Day 8	Decision Making Perspectives: Cognitive Model	Infrastructure Vulnerabilities and Crisis Response
Day 9	Interagency Process: President and National Security Council	Reform of Government Interagency Processes
Day 10	Interagency Process: Executive Branch Agencies	Human Security
Days 11-12	National Security Council Decision Meetings	NSC Meetings
Final Class	Conclusions for Decision Making and Public Policy	

DAY 1 – TOPIC: INTRODUCTION TO DECISION MAKING AND PUBLIC POLICY

The underlying principle for all organizations that are involved in public policy is that the participants operate within a complex decision making environment. As individuals and governments face important questions about their choices and responsibilities, it is essential for the scholarly and decision making communities to understand the environment in which decisions and policies are framed and made. The first week is designed to outline for the student the nature of decision making in organizations and the essence of the public policy choices that decision makers routinely confront. This course will increase the students' understanding of the major political, organizational, and behavioral phenomena that are relevant both to governmental decision making, apply these frameworks internationally, and thereby encourage the student to comprehend the nature of effective participation in this process.

THEORY: INTRODUCTION TO DECISION MAKING & PUBLIC POLICY

REQUIRED READINGS

- Charles Lindblom, *The Policy-Making Process* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1980).
- Richard E. Neustadt, Richard R. May, *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers* (New York: The Free Press, 1988).
- Roger Hilsman, *The Politics of Policy Making in Defense and Foreign Affairs* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992).
- Arthur Cyr and Peter DeLeon, *Comparative Policy Analysis* (Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, 1975).
- William N. Dunn and R.M. Kelly, *Advances in Policy Studies since 1950* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1992).

CASE STUDY: PROLIFERATION OF WMDs

- Michael Levi, *Deterring State Sponsorship of Nuclear Terrorism* Council on Foreign Relations, Council Special Report No. 39, September 2008.
- GAO-07-133R *DNDO's Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office/Department of Homeland Security's Cost Benefit Analysis for Next Generation Radiation Detection Equipment*, October 17, 2006.

DAY 2 – TOPIC: INFLUENCES ON DECISION MAKING: INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL

Despite the state's considerable military, economic, technological, and diplomatic power, its policies are decisively shaped by the actions of many other actors in the international system. These actors include states, nations, intergovernmental organizations, and non-governmental organizations all of which operate in a constantly changing international system. The current trend toward greater and more complex economic, political, and military interdependence within the international political system suggests that international actors may gain even greater influence in future U.S. policy making. The second week is designed to outline the range of international actors that influence decision making in all governments. By studying the distribution of power and influence in the international political system and the tools and rules used to translate that power in decisions, we can gain greater insight into the forces that contribute to both better decisions and policy making. Thus, we consider how the development of new actors, rules and trends present major challenges to decision makers. Specifically, we discuss how the power of ideas and norms, developments in international law, the role of religion and ideology, and the spread of terrorism influence public policy. Though not easily measurable, ideas have always been important components of the international system. Today, several important norms – ideas that govern behavior by shaping what actors believe is appropriate behavior – are in a state of flux. Using the case of terrorism, we consider how ideas influence the nature of decision making.

THEORY: INFLUENCES ON DECISION MAKING: INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL

REQUIRED READINGS

- Mark W. Zacher, "The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force," *International Organization*, Spring 2001, pp. 215-50.
- David Davenport, "The New Diplomacy," *Policy Review*, December 2002/ January 2003, pp. 17-31.
- Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr. "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, Sep/Oct 1998, pp. 81-89.
- Stephen M. Walt, "International Relations: One World, Many Theories," *Foreign Affairs*, Spring 1998, pp.29-46.
- Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr. "Globalization: What's New, What's Not? (And So What?)," *Foreign Policy*, Spring 2000, pp 104-119.
- *The UN In-Brief*, accessed at <http://www.un.org>.
- Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* "Chapter 1: Defining Terrorism," (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).
- Martha Crenshaw, "Why America? The Globalization of Civil War," *Current History*, December 2001, pp. 425-432.

CASE STUDY: TERRORISM

- Angel Rabasa, Robert D. Blackwill et al. *The Lessons of Mumbai*, Occasional Paper 249, RAND, January 2009.

DAY 3 – TOPIC: INFLUENCES ON DECISION MAKING: DOMESTIC POLITICAL

This week focuses on the domestic political system, including the critical actors, rules and tools that directly and indirectly influence decision making in the public policy arena. The objective is to evaluate how domestic institutions, including interest groups, public opinion, and the media, influence decision making. Those who have not participated in domestic political processes often have difficulty appreciating the complexity of the interactions and the ways in which these organizations influence decision making. Public opinion represents one of the most potent forces found in the domestic political system, but it is not easy to energize or control. Numerous decision makers in the domestic political system struggle with public opinion and media whose influence is so important that it cannot be simply dismissed as irrelevant. Since the majority of the public gets its knowledge of domestic and international events from mass media sources, leaders in public and private sector organizations as well as an ever increasing number of special interest groups are well aware of this fact -- and seek to use the media as a conduit to communicate and gain support for their agendas. Great debates have raged regarding the role of the media in this process. This session focuses on public opinion, interest groups, the news media and the complex ways in which they can interact.

THEORY: INFLUENCES ON DECISION MAKING: DOMESTIC POLITICAL**REQUIRED READINGS**

- Ralph J. Begleiter, "Whose Media Are We? Notions of Media and Nationality Challenged by the 'War on Terrorism'," *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Winter 2002, pp. 17-26.
- John Mueller, *Policy and Opinion in the Gulf War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), pp. 69-79.
- Eric V. Larson, Bogdan Savych, *American Support for U.S. Military Operations from Mogadishu to Baghdad* (Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, 2005), pp. 91-127.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Allen Schick, *The Federal Budget: Politics, Policy, Process* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2000).
- James Lindsay, *Congress and the Politics of U.S. Foreign Policy* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).
- Eric V. Larson, *Casualties and Consensus: The Historical Role of Casualties in Domestic Support for U.S. Military Operations* (Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, MR-726-RC, 1996).

CASE STUDY: BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

- Richard Garwin, *Holes in the Missile Shield*, *Scientific American*, 2004, p.70-79.
- Victor A. Utgoff, "Missile Defence and American Ambitions, in *The Use of Force*, 6th ed., chap. 21.

- Kenneth N. Waltz, “Missile Defenses and the Multiplication of Nuclear Weapons,” in *The Use of Force*, 6th ed., chap. 22.
- Scott D. Sagan, “Nuclear Instability in South Asia,” in *The Use of Force*, 6th ed., chap. 24.
- Kenneth N. Waltz, “Nuclear Stability in South Asia,” in *The Use of Force*, 6th ed., chap. 25.

DAY 4 -- TOPIC: ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES: AN INTRODUCTION AND CASE STUDY

There are several contending perspectives that are used to explain how decisions are made in the public policy arena. One perspective is that national security decision making is a rational process in which public policy choices are made by decision makers who carefully evaluate all the possible options, understand the consequences of each option relative to well-defined national interests, and choose the option that best promotes those national interests. Other perspectives emphasize the different interests, experiences and analytical capabilities of the various organizations and individuals involved in the decision-making process. These perspectives see decisions as resulting from organizational processes, imperatives, and pressures; from the interpersonal dynamics among key advisors; or from the personal convictions, values, or cognitive limitations of the decision-maker. To understand these competing perspectives, this week focuses on the outlining the basic elements of these perspectives using the Cuban Missile Crisis to illustrate the usefulness of the four perspectives in analyzing policy choices. Each of these perspectives will be addressed in greater detail with corresponding case studies during the next several weeks.

THEORY: ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES: AN INTRODUCTION

REQUIRED READINGS

- Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, “Introduction,” *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, Second Edition* (New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 1-12.
- Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, “The Cuban Missile Crisis: A First Cut,” *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, Second Edition* (New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 77-142.
- Martin Libicki, “Rethinking War: The Mouse’s New Roar,” *Foreign Policy*, Winter 1999, pp. 30-43.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Ernest R. May and Philip Zelikow, *The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the White House During the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1997).
- Donald Kagan, *On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace* (New York: Doubleday, 1995).

CASE STUDY: ENERGY VULNERABILITIES

- Energy Security: Issues Related to Potential Reductions in Venezuelan Oil Production, GAO Report 06-668, June 2006.
- John Deutsch and James Schlesinger. *National Security Consequences of U.S. Oil Dependency*, CFR Independent Task Force Report No. 58, 2006.

DAY 5 -- TOPIC: Decision Making Perspectives: Rational Actor Model

The first of the perspectives to be addressed is the *rational actor model*. The essence of this perspective is that decision making is defined in terms of a rational process by which policymakers evaluate the ends and means of policies. These individuals also carefully evaluate public policy choices in terms of all possible options, the consequences of each option relative to well-defined interests, and then select the option (or options) that best promote those interests. The presumption is that decision makers will have access to all pertinent information and that the organizational structure is designed to develop and implement options that represent the best possible set of alternatives.

THEORY: Decision Making Perspectives: Rational Actor Model

REQUIRED READINGS

- Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, "Model I: The Rational Actor," *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, Second Edition* (New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 13-76.
- Central Intelligence Agency, *Unclassified Report to Congress on the Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions, 1 January Through 30 June 2002* (Washington, DC: April 2003).
- *The Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction (hereinafter, The Robb-Silberman Report), Report to the President of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: March 31, 2005).
- Daniel Byman, "Iraq After Saddam," *The Washington Quarterly*, Autumn 2001, pp. 151-162.
- *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: The White House, September 2002).
- "President Says Saddam Hussein Must Leave Iraq within 48 Hours; Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation," March 17, 2003, accessed at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030317-7.html>.
- "President Discusses Beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom," March 22, 2003, accessed at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030322.html>.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Richard Zeckhauser, *Strategy and Choice* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991).
- Larry Diamond, "What Went Wrong in Iraq," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2004, pp. 34-56.

- Bob Woodward, *Plan of Attack: The Definitive Account of the Decision to Invade Iraq* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004).

CASE STUDY: CYBER SECURITY

- Lewis, James A. *Securing Cyberspace for the 44th Presidency; A Report of the CSIS Commission on Cybersecurity for the 44th Presidency*, Center for Strategic and International Studies, December 2008 (Executive Summary, Summary of Recommendations, Chapter 7, and Conclusion).
- The National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace 2003 (Executive Summary).
- The President’s Information Technology Advisory Committee. *Cybersecurity: A Crisis of Prioritization*, February 2005, (Chapter 1: Executive Summary and Chapter 4: Findings and Recommendations).

DAY 6 – TOPIC: DECISION MAKING PERSPECTIVES: ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR MODEL

The *organizational behavior model* emphasizes the different interests, experiences and analytical capabilities of the various organizations and individuals involved in the decision-making process. Furthermore, it sees decisions as the result of organizational processes, imperatives, and pressures. Policy and behavior are often summarized as actions chosen by a unitary, rational decision maker, despite the fact that it is not individuals but large and complex organizations, which Allison describes as “a vast conglomerate of loosely allied organizations, each with a substantial life of its own.” Organizations, including governments, perceive issues through the sensors of component organizations, which define their alternatives on particular issues according to predetermined standard operating procedures and organizational biases. Organizations tend to have bureaucratic characteristics, including hierarchical structure, formal lines of authority, degrees of specialization, and standard operating procedures. All organizations develop their own unique culture, which has many positive influences including the development of a strong sense of mission among organization members. Culture also causes organizations to employ informal and unofficial processes, notably selective attention toward tasks that are part of the culture at the expense of other tasks. This session focuses on how organizations behave in general, and how they respond to change and crises.

THEORY: DECISION MAKING PERSPECTIVES: ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR MODEL

REQUIRED READINGS

- Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, “Model II: Organizational Behavior,” *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Second Edition (New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 143-196.
- Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations* (New York: The Free Press, 1976), chapters 1 & 2, pp. 1-44.
- Dana Milbank, “Bush Seeks to Rule the Bureaucracies,” *Washington Post*, November 22, 2004.
- “Presidential Address to the Nation,” October 7, 2001, accessed at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011007-8.html>.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Mark M. Lowenthal and Richard A. Best, Jr., *The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment* (Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 1993).
- W.I. Jenkins, *Policy Analysis: A Political and Organizational Perspective* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978).
- Nicos P. Mouzelis, *Organisation and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1975), Part One.
- Bob Woodward, *Bush at War* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002).

CASE STUDY: ROLE OF INTELLIGENCE

- *NIE: Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Program*, October 2002.
 - *NIE: Iran Nuclear Program and Capabilities*, 2007.
 - *Preparing for the 21st Century an Appraisal of U.S. intelligence – The Role of Intelligence*
-

DAY 7 – TOPIC: DECISION MAKING PERSPECTIVES: GOVERNMENTAL POLITICS MODEL

When important decisions must be made and rigorous analytical solutions are difficult to obtain, the *government politics model* necessarily enters into the selection of alternatives. Moreover, power and influence are the language in which political discourse takes place. The unique characteristics of bureaucracy dictate that participants must understand and exercise personal power and influence to be effective. Power and influence are tools required by every successful leader or manager. In public policy, success usually depends upon the assistance or at least the cooperation of others. With many advocates competing for limited resources, formal authority alone is rarely, if ever, adequate to accomplish one's objective. Furthermore, issues seldom have a course of action so clearly superior that reasonable people could not disagree upon actions to be taken. The most effective individuals in this environment are those who understand the tools of power and influence, how these tools are acquired, and how they are used effectively. In this session, we discuss the tools of power and influence and analyze their sources as coalitions form among like-minded individuals.

THEORY: DECISION MAKING PERSPECTIVES: GOVERNMENTAL POLITICS MODEL

REQUIRED READINGS

- Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, "Model III: Governmental Politics," *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, Second Edition* (New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 255-324.
- *The Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction (hereinafter, The Robb-Silberman Report), Report to the President of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: March 31, 2005).
- *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: The White House, September 2002).

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Hedrick Smith, *The Power Game: How Washington Works* (New York, Random House, 1988).
- Jennifer Sims, *Transforming Intelligence* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005).

- Colin L. Powell, *My American Journey* (New York: Random House, 1995), chapters 17 & 18.
- Bob Woodward, *Bush at War* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002).
- Paul Kengor and Patricia Clark Doerner, *The Judge: William P. Clark, Ronald Reagan's Top Hand* (Ignatius Press, 2007).

CASE STUDY: PANDEMICS AND GLOBAL CONTAGION

- Garrett, Laurie. *HIV/AIDS and National Security: What are the Links?*, Council on Foreign Relations Special Report, 2005.
- GAO Report 06-221T: *Influenza Pandemic: Applying Lessons Learned from the 2004–05 Influenza Vaccine Shortage*, Testimony before the Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives, November 4, 2005.

DAY 8 – TOPIC: DECISION MAKING PERSPECTIVES: COGNITIVE MODEL

The final perspective is the *cognitive model*, which addresses how the policy maker's beliefs, biases, values, emotions, personal experiences, and memories influence decision making processes. Sometimes the effect is obvious--as when the decision maker's emotions or impatience might short-circuit the evaluation of options. In other instances the effect may be subtle--as when a decision maker's preconceptions or biases produce a personal predisposition towards one option or another, or skepticism about the estimated costs and benefits of particular options. In still other cases a decision maker may be so emotionally or physically exhausted that it hinders clear thought and action. This session examines the cognitive perspective and considers how individuals gather and evaluate data, deal with uncertainty and information overload, and make decisions that would not be predicted by the rational actor, organizational, or government politics models.

THEORY: DECISION MAKING PERSPECTIVES: COGNITIVE MODEL

REQUIRED READINGS

- John D. Steinbruner, *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision: New Dimensions of Political Analysis* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974), chapters 4 & 5, pp. 88-139.
- Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, "Conclusion," *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, Second Edition* (New York: Longman, 1999), pp. 379-407.
- Irving L. Janis, "A Perfect Failure: Group Think and the Bay of Pigs," *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982), pp. 14-30, 35-47.
- Alexander L. George, "The Role of Knowledge in Policymaking," in *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2000), pp. 19-29.
- Elizabeth Bumiller, "In the New Bush Cabinet, Loyalty Trumps Celebrity," *New York Times*, November 22, 2004.
- Richard E. Neustadt, Richard R. May, *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers* (New York: The Free Press, 1988), chapter 3, pp. 48-57.

- “Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People,” September 20, 2001, accessed at www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html.
- “Executive Summary,” *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004), pp.

CASE STUDY: INFRASTRUCTURE VULNERABILITIES AND CRISIS RESPONSE

- American Society of Civil Engineers Critical Infrastructure Report Card 2009: <http://www.asce.org/reportcard/2009/>
- ASCE 2009 Gradation Definitions: <http://www.asce.org/reportcard/2009/grades.cfm>
- ASCE 2005 Report Card (full document – skim)
- Clinton, William J. Presidential Decision Directive – 63 (May 22, 1998).
- Busch, George W. Homeland Security Presidential Directive – 7 (December 17, 2003).

DAY 9 – TOPIC: INTERAGENCY PROCESS: PRESIDENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

The focal point for public sector decision making in dozens of countries, including the United States, is the National Security Council, which sits astride the interagency process (which we examine in detail in Week Ten). Historically, a series of foreign and domestic events have increased the power of the executive. Since World War II and during the Cold War, the increasing complexity of international problems has required the president to gain advice and information from a wide variety of expert sources, all while working within an expanding Executive branch. To help the student understand the influence and role of the NSC in decision making, this session focuses on the origins and functions of the NSC, the formal and informal processes by which advisors, including the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, are used within various presidential administrations, the ways in which the interagency process is dominated by the NSC, whether the NSC provides an effective tool for decision making, and various management styles presidents have employed to get advice and information.

THEORY: INTERAGENCY PROCESS: PRESIDENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

REQUIRED READINGS

- Ivo H. Daalder, I.M. Destler, “Toolbox: Advice for the Advisor,” *The American Interest*, January-February 2009, pp. 47-60.
- Ivo H. Daalder, I.M. Destler, “In the Shadow of the Oval Office: The Next National Security Adviser,” *Foreign Affairs*, January-February 2009, pp. 47-60.
- Aaron L. Friedberg, “Strengthening U.S. Strategic Planning,” *Washington Quarterly*, Winter 2007-08, pp. 47-60.
- Ivo H. Daalder and I. M. Destler, *A New NSC for a New Administration* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, November 2000), available at: <http://www.brook.edu/comm/policybriefs/pb068/pb68.htm>.
- I.M. Destler, “Review Essay: The Power Brokers: An Uneven History of the National Security Council,” *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2005, pp. 155-160.

- Colin L. Powell, *My American Journey* (New York: Random House, 1995), chapter 14.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Carnes Lord, *The Presidency and the Management of National Security* (New York: The Free Press, 1988).
- David Rothkopf, *Running the World: The Inside Story of the National Security Council and the Architects of American Power* (New York: Public Affairs, 2005).
- Christopher C. Shoemaker, “The Functional Requisites,” *Structure, Function and the NSC Staff: An Officer’s Guide to the National Security Council* (Carlisle Barracks PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 1989).
- Cecil Crabb, *American National Security: A Presidential Perspective* (New York: 1991).
- Karl F. Inderfurth and Loch K. Johnson, *Decisions of the Highest Order: Perspectives on the National Security Council* (California: Brooks/Cole Publishing, 1988).

CASE STUDY: REFORM OF GOVERNMENT INTERAGENCY PROCESSES

- Gorman, Martin J. and Alexander Krongard. *A Goldwater-Nichols Act for the U.S. Government Institutionalizing the Interagency Process*, Joint Forces Quarterly, Fourth Quarter 2005; Issue 39.
- Dahl, Kenneth R. *New Security for New Threats- The Case for Reforming the Interagency Process*, The Brookings Institution, 21st Century Defense Initiative, Foreign Policy Studies; July 2007.

DAY 10 – TOPIC: INTERAGENCY PROCESS: EXECUTIVE BRANCH AGENCIES AND PROCESSES¹

The interagency process – a codeword for organizational processes in public and private sector organizations -- is designed to assist the chief executive in developing, coordinating, articulating, and implementing decisions in virtually all areas of policy. In the case of the United States this process involves a large number of executive branch departments and agencies, including the Departments of Defense, State, Commerce, Treasury, Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, Director of National Intelligence, and Interior, among others. Since all of these organizations have important responsibilities in making and implementing public policy, all are active participants in the interagency process. The objective is to describe the general interagency structures and processes of governmental decision making as well as identify the authorities and roles of key departments and agencies. This session examines the interagency process in order to help the student understand the nature of policy making and its implications for how organizations (including governments) design and execute policy. The student will be exposed to the breadth and depth of the interagency process using the United States as the case study to focus our discussion on the departments and agencies that have important policy making responsibilities in the interagency process.

REQUIRED READINGS

- John Deutch, Arnold Kanter, and Brent Scowcroft, “Strengthening the National Security Interagency Process,” in Ashton B. Carter and John P. White (editors),

¹ While we will use the example of the interagency process in the United States, it should be noted that the principles articulated apply equally to all governments.

Keeping the Edge: Managing Defense for the Future (Cambridge, MA: Preventive Defense Project, September 2000), pp. 265-83.

- George T. Raach and Ilana Kass, “National Power and the Interagency Process,” *Joint Forces Quarterly*, Summer 1995, pp. 8-13.
- Martin J. Gorman and Alexander Krongard, “A Goldwater-Nichols Act for the U.S. Government: Institutionalizing the Interagency Process,” *Joint Forces Quarterly*, xxxx/xxxx, pp. 51-58.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Alan G. Whittaker, Frederick C. Smith and Elizabeth McKune, *The National Security Policy Process: The National Security Council and Interagency System* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 2004).
- William C. Martel, *Improving the USAF Technology Transfer Process* (Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, 1991).

CASE STUDY: HUMAN SECURITY

- United Nations Commission on Human Security, *Outline of the Report of the Commission on Human Security*, May 2003.
- United Nations Commission on Human Security, *Chapter 1: Human Security Now*, May 2003.

DAYS 11-12 -- TOPIC: NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL DECISION MEETINGS

To integrate the concepts and principles examined in this course, we conclude with exercises in which students prepare policy memoranda on a selected problem and defend it in a simulated decision meeting of the National Security Council. Each of these exercises will involve a decision that the president needs to make in an area related to both domestic and international policy. In this meeting, the students will play the role of NSC principals who are responsible for presenting their positions in which the president is expected to make a decision. Once the nature of the specific issue is outlined in class, each student will be required to write a decision memorandum that will be presented and discussed at this meeting. While we will discuss the details in class, each memorandum must discuss relevant background on the issue, the specific recommendation being made by the principal, the advantages and disadvantages of this recommendation, and anticipated objections by other principals. These exercises will put into practice the theories and practices discussed during the course, including how decisions are made in the public policy arena and the forces that influence them.

TOPIC: NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL DECISION MEETINGS

REQUIRED READINGS

Background materials for the decision exercises will be distributed later in the term.

Iran-Israel crisis
Africa crisis

Mexico crisis
Energy crisis
Financial crisis
Afghanistan-Pakistan crisis

LAST CLASS -- CONCLUSIONS FOR DECISION MAKING AND PUBLIC POLICY

As the conclusion to the course, we will consider how decision making processes influence the conduct of public policy, and examine the implications for governmental actions and choices on an international scale in an era when the fundamental nature of domestic and international security are being reshaped.

REQUIRED READINGS

- John S. Hammond, Ralph L. Keeney, and Howard Raiffa, "The Hidden Traps In Decision Making," *Harvard Business Review*, September-October 1998.
 - Brita Schwarz, K.C. Bowen, I. Kiss, and E.S. Quade, "Guidance for Decision," in Hugh J. Miser and Edward S. Quade (editors), *Handbook of Systems Analysis* (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, 1985), pp. 219-247.
 - David E. Wilson, "Analytical Framework: Five Approaches to National Planning," *The National Planning Idea in U.S. Public Policy: Five Alternative Approaches* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980), pp. 117-159.
 - E.S. Quade, "Pitfalls and Limitations," in E.S. Quade and W.I. Boucher (editors) *Systems Analysis and Policy Planning* (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 345-363.
 - X (George Kennan), "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs*, July 1947.
-