

POLS: 30210

U.S. National Security Policymaking: History, Institutions, and Statecraft

Department of Political Science and Notre Dame International Security Center

[Fall 2024 – Tuesday & Thursday, 12:30:13:45 Debart 116]

Instructors:

Daniel Lindley

2170 Jenkins and Nanovic Halls

Office Hours: Wednesdays 14:15-15:45; Thursdays 15:45-17:15; and by appointment [email]

dlindley@nd.edu

[o] 574-631-3226

Description of the course:

This course serves as a foundation for subsequent coursework in international security. It is a required course in the Notre Dame International Security Center's undergraduate certificate program, but it is also appropriate for, and open to, any Notre Dame student interested in U.S. national security policymaking. It is also one possible prerequisite for the minor in International Security Studies – others include POLS USFP or a HIST course in military history.

In this course, you will explore the history and development of U.S. national security policy from the Founding through the present. Next, you will examine the primary institutions involved in U.S. national security policymaking. Finally, you will study the tools and instruments of military statecraft as applied by the United States. In the last few weeks of the course, you will integrate and apply your knowledge in a simulation exercise in which you will role-play a key participant in the U.S. national security policymaking process.

At a minimum, you will learn the analytical tools, historical knowledge, and current events background to become a more informed citizen, particularly with respect to important national debates about when and how our country should use military force. At a maximum, you may become interested enough in the topic to pursue a career in either the practice or the study of U.S. national security policy.

Concretely, after completing this course you will be able to:

1. Demonstrate an integrative understanding of the institutional and policy components of national security.

-
- 2. Critically interpret and appraise others' arguments about the physical, strategic, and moral impact of national security policies.
- 3. Develop and defend your own arguments about the effects of various technological and strategic developments.
- 4. Undertake independent research of some depth and sophistication.
- 5. Write and present research and policy positions clearly and concisely.

We believe in the complementarity of the policy and scholarly worlds. Scholars benefit from policy experience, and policymakers benefit from academic analytical skills. This belief is the foundation for this course and for the NDISC national security certificate program that continues beyond this gateway.

Procedures and standards for evaluating student performance:

You should attend every lecture and do all of the reading before the class session for which it is assigned. The lectures will cover material beyond the readings. Participation in discussion is not mandatory due to the size of the class, but we have found a generally positive correlation between participation and grades.

Grading Rubric:

- Essay #1 = 20%
- Essay #2 = 25%
- Simulation Oral Grade = 10%
- Simulation White Paper = 25%
- Weekly quizzes/talk responses = 20% (lowest two quizzes will be dropped)

All excellent work will receive an A. All good and competent work will receive a B. Work with some significant flaws will receive a C. Work with very significant flaws will receive a D along with recommendations or requirements to speak with the professors, special counseling or advising services, or another university resource, as appropriate. Incompetent, negligent, or non-existent work will receive an F.

The weekly quizzes will be administered in class and each one will cover the reading assignments and class lectures / discussions from the previous two class sessions (that is, not the reading for the day on which the quiz is due, because we will not have discussed that reading in class yet). We will establish a grading scale for each quiz to translate your raw score (the number of questions that you got correct on the quiz) into a letter grade, taking

into account the difficulty of the questions. So on a four-question quiz, getting one wrong (75%) will not automatically translate into a C; more commonly, a perfect score will be an A, and getting a question wrong might earn a B+, though sometimes it will earn a B or an A-, depending on how hard the questions were.

In addition, you must attend three national security-related lecture/talks sponsored by the Notre Dame International Security center (NDISC) or one of the other institutes or programs on campus. (The NDISC Fall seminar and events schedule is at: <https://ndisc.nd.edu/>). The speaker may be an outside scholar or practitioner or a local scholar or practitioner. You must write a $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{2}{3}$ page (150 words or so) response paper for each talk and hand it in to the TA / instructor at the next class. A response paper gives your reactions to the talk, addresses issues raised, and so forth. If you turn in fewer than the required three lecture response papers, we will deduct two-tenths of a GPA point per missed response paper from your final quiz grade.

The essay and simulation assignments are discussed in detail at the end of the syllabus, after the list of readings assigned for each class session.

We will grant extensions for legitimate reasons, for example if you or a family member is ill. Other reasons should be discussed well in advance with the professors or the TA. Flexibility may be possible ahead of time; very little is possible after the fact. If your schedule requires flexibility from us, then you must plan well in advance. Most students have lots of work and commitments. We must be fair to those who do not ask for extensions and face similar or worse time pressures. *A fait accompli* (turning something in late without permission) is better than the alternative of not handing anything in, but it reflects poorly on you. We will adjust grades on assignments turned in late without advance approval accordingly.

Academic Integrity: All students must abide by the Notre Dame Honor Code: "As a member of the Notre Dame community ... I will not participate in or tolerate academic dishonesty." Details are available at <https://honorcode.nd.edu>. We will not tolerate academic dishonesty (including plagiarism, unauthorized multiple submissions of work for assignments, cooperation / copying others' answers on quizzes, and unauthorized cooperation on essays and papers), and we will punish it severely. If we suspect academic dishonesty, we will use Turnitin.com to determine whether your work is original.

Do not cheat. Your work must be your own. In writing for political science courses, cheating is most likely to take the form of plagiarism. Plagiarism is the use other people's words or ideas without giving credit to the original author. Use endnotes to give credit for direct quotes, paraphrased quotes, or borrowed ideas. We will explain how to use endnotes in

-
class; you may also find <https://www.uregina.ca/arts/history/bibliography.html> helpful. If you don't know what endnotes are, ask! Do not quote or paraphrase without giving credit in footnotes or endnotes, regardless of your source, including online articles, books, and other print sources.

Do not copy other people's old papers. Do not use your own old papers or use work done for another course. Do not copy or buy papers or sections of papers from the web or other sources.

Your ideas, your arguments, and the vast majority of your text must be your own. Everything that is not your own must be noted. Possible penalties for cheating include redoing work, lowered grades, course failure, letters on your permanent record, and expulsion. Every year, a number of students are not allowed to graduate because they cheated. Cheating is a more-than-\$60,000-per-year mistake.

You MUST use citations when:

- you use other people's words or ideas in any way, from direct quotes to paraphrasing to borrowed ideas.
- you include a fact that is not commonly known. Anything you had to look up must be cited.

You must also NOT use CHAT GPT or any AI to do any of your writing. University policy: "Representing work that you did not produce as your own, including work generated or materially modified by AI, constitutes academic dishonesty. Use of generative AI in a way that violates an instructor's articulated policy, or using it to complete coursework in a way not expressly permitted by the faculty member, will be considered a violation of the Honor Code." Professors may modify this policy. Keep in mind that grammar checkers and editing tools such as Grammarly may use generative AI, in which case they are not allowed in this class. With one exception. You may use them ONLY to check for passive voice problems. Learning to write trains your mind to clarify, simplify, and make arguments. These are critical skills. Do not cheat yourself!

Students with Disabilities: We are strongly committed to working with students who have any disability recognized under the Americans with Disabilities Act to ensure that they are able to fully participate in class activities. If you feel you require a "reasonable accommodation," please follow the process through <https://sarabeadisabilityservices.nd.edu>.

Computer policy: Research about education has shown that students who use laptop computers or other electronic screens to take notes during class learn the material less well

than those who take notes by hand. Computerized notes tempt you to try to take dictation during class rather than to try to process the information that you are receiving. Computers also present the temptation to engage in non-class activities, and notifications of incoming messages can be distracting. Finally, use (and abuse) of computer screens can distract your classmates as well, harming their educations (<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/22/business/laptops-not-during-lectureormeeeting.html? r=0>). Consequently, we do not permit students to use laptop computers or other electronic screens in class unless we arrange a specific exception to this policy.

Of course, you may at times (say, due to necessary quarantining) access the course via Zoom, which will require you to use your computer. When you do so, you should focus on your Zoom session and not engage with any other software during class (email, messaging, Facebook, web browsing, game playing, etc.). You should also use Zoom as a communications conduit, and you should still hand-write notes on the course content.

Health and Safety Protocols: In this class, as elsewhere on campus, you must comply with all current University health and safety protocols, updated as necessary and as permitted by the instructor and which may include:

- Wear face masks that completely cover the nose and mouth;
- Maintain physical distance as possible;

We are part of a community of learning in which compassionate care for one another is part of our spiritual and social charter. Consequently, we expect compliance with these protocols. If you refuse to comply with the University's health and safety protocols, you must leave the classroom and will earn an unexcused absence for the class period and any assignments for the day. Persistent deviation from expected health and safety guidelines may be considered a violation of the University's "[Standards of Conduct](#)," as articulated in [du Lac: A Guide for Student Life](#), and we will refer you accordingly.

Privacy Practices: This course is a community built on trust; in order to create the most effective learning experience, our interactions, discussions, and course activities must remain private and free from external intrusion. As members of this course community, we have obligations to each other to preserve privacy and cultivate fearless inquiry. We are also obliged to respect the individual dignity of all and to refrain from actions that diminish others' ability to learn.

Class Readings: We will be using two books available through Amazon.com or the university bookstore:

-
Paula G. Thornhill, *Demystifying the American Military: Institutions, Evolution, and Challenges since 1789* (Annapolis, MD: US Naval Institute Press, 2019).

Harvey M. Sapolsky, Eugene Gholz, and Caitlin Talmadge, *U.S. Defense Politics: The Origins of Security Policy* [4th ed.] (London: Routledge, 2020).

All other readings will be available electronically. We will post the syllabus and power point slides for each class on a Sakai shared folder.

Useful Supplemental Sources: Professor Lindley has designed his website <http://www.nd.edu/~dlindley/> to make current events and international relations research fairly easy. Near the top of the page are links to various newspapers, journals, branches of government, international organizations, and various think tanks and non-governmental organizations. You may wish to bookmark the page for the duration of the course. He uses it to click around and get his daily fix on news and views. Many other useful handouts are also available there under HANDOUTS and ADVICE. He welcomes ideas for additions, corrections on dead links, etc.

Schedule of Topics and Assigned Readings:

We may tweak / adjust the readings for particular class sessions; if we do, we will let you know in advance, and we will make the new readings available via Sakai.

Part I: History

8/27/24: Introduction to the Course.

- Thornhill, Chapter 1.
- Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1997), Appendix: How to Write a Paper, pp. 123-8. See my website under handouts.

8/29/24: The Constitutional Basis for American Defense Policy [Lindley]

- Thornhill, Chapter 3.
- Constitution of the United States, Article I, sec. 8, 10-16 and Article II, sec. 1, 1 at:
<http://constitutionus.com/>

9/3/24: **Quiz Due.** The Civil War and Saving the Union [Lindley]

-
- Thornhill, Chapter 4.

9/5/24: Military Reform and the Spanish-American War [Lindley]

- Thornhill, Chapter 5.

9/10/24: **Quiz due.** World War I [Lindley]

- Thornhill, Chapter 6
- Paul M. Kennedy, "The First World War and the International Power System," *International Security*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 7-40. Skim the text; study the charts.

9/12/24: World War II [Lindley]

- Thornhill, chapter 7.

9/17/24: **Quiz due.** The Cold War – Nuclear Strategy and Conventional War in Korea

[Lindley] - Thornhill, Chapter 9.

9/19/24: Vietnam and its aftermath [Lindley]

- Thornhill, Chapter 10.

Part II: Institutions and Processes

9/24/24: **Quiz due.** Introduction to processes [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 1.

9/26/24: **Paper #1 due.** The President [Lindley]

Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 10.

10/1/24: **Quiz due.** Congress and Interest Groups [Lindley] -

Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 9.

10/3/24: Who's in the Military? [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 5.

-
10/8/24: **Quiz due.** Veterans [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 13.

10/10/24: The Pentagon and the Office of the Secretary of Defense

- [Lindley] - Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 4.

10/15/24: **Quiz due.** The Services [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 6.

10/17/24: **Simulation role preference due.** Civil-Military Relations

- [Lindley] - Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 3.

FALL BREAK

10/29/24: **Quiz due.** The Defense Budget [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 7.

-

10/31/24: Acquisition and Innovation [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 8.

11/5/24: **Quiz due.** The Intelligence Community and Threat Assessment [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 11.
- Skim: Richard K. Betts, "Surprise Despite Warning: Why Sudden Attacks Succeed," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 95, No. 4 (Winter 1980-81), pp. 551-572.

11/7/24: Homeland Security [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 12.

Part III: Statecraft and Simulation

-

11/12/24: **Quiz due. Paper #2 due** Nuclear Weapons 101 [Lindley]

- Fact Sheets:
 - Union of Concerned Scientists, “How Do Nuclear Weapons Work?”
<https://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear-weapons/how-do-nuclearweaponswork#.XDUWqaa6yw5>.
 - Arms Control Association, “Nuclear Weapons: Who Has What, at a Glance,”
<https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/Nuclearweaponswhohaswhat>
 - Hans M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, “Global nuclear weapons inventories, 1945–2013,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 2013, Vol. 69, No. 5 (September 1, 2013), pp. 75-81.
 - Thorough primer: <https://www.wisconsinproject.org/nuclear-weapons/>
 - U.S. Congressional Research Service, “U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues,” Updated November 21, 2018, pp. 1-10. The rest is background for the simulation on the nuclear budget. Be sure to read it as part of your simulation preparation.
 - (Very optional!) For any nuke nuts, here is a whole semester class worth of lectures on nukes: <http://isis-online.org/conferences/detail/nuclear-nonproliferationtechnical-primer/>
-

11/14/24: . **Simulated Nuclear Posture Review due** Deterrence and Arms Control [Lindley]

- Gerard Powers, “From Nuclear Deterrence to Disarmament: Evolving Catholic Perspectives,”
Arms Control Today, Vol. 45, No. 4 (May 2015), pp. 8-13.
- Richard K. Betts, “The Lost Logic of Deterrence: What the Strategy That Won the Cold War Can—and Can’t—Do Now,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92, No. 2 (March/April 2013), pp. 87-99.

11/19/24: **Quiz due.** Simulation Team Meetings

11/21/24: Strategy/Grand Strategy [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 2.

11/26/24: **Quiz due.** Conclusion [Lindley]

Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, Chapter 14.

-
12/3/24: Simulation Exercise – Part 1

12/5/24: Simulation Exercise – Part 2

12/10/24: Simulation Exercise – After Action Review

12/12/24 Buffer Day

Writing Assignments
POLS 30210
US National Security Policymaking
Professor Dan Lindley

One of the goals of this course is to help students analyze issues in national security, applying evidence and theoretical frameworks to form your own views of the best policy to adopt. Another is to prepare you to write up a recommended course of action to resolve a problem, communicating the results of your analysis concisely and convincingly. Your paper assignments will help you build these skills (conducting analysis and communicating your perspective). The first paper is due at the end of our section on History, the second is due at the end of our section on Institutions, and the third is due as part of the culminating simulation. Each paper should be five pages long – no more, because you should imagine writing the paper for a very busy, politically influential reader.

For the first paper, you are to consider an important juncture in the history of U.S. national security policy and to write a recommendation for a policy choice the United States did NOT make. You can ONLY use information that was available to the relevant decision-makers at the time. This paper assignment leaves you quite a lot of freedom to choose a topic of personal interest, a wonderful invitation to the curious but quicksand for a procrastinator. The paper will require you to do some independent research; your professors will be happy to discuss a proposed topic with you and to offer some suggestions for possible sources. Note that Wikipedia and other general-interest encyclopedias are not appropriate sources for collegelevel work, so do not cite them in the paper that you ultimately turn in. However, you may use those sources for quick, initial familiarization with a topic before you begin your more serious research.

For the second paper, we will hand out a prompt two weeks before the paper is due. The questions will lead you to make a recommendation to fix a policy problem whose roots lie in institutions. The course readings introduce and critique many US national security institutions and so can serve as the jumping off point for your research and writing. For purposes of the assignment, remember that institutions can take several forms. On the formal side, they can be organizations formed for political purposes (to make decisions about the use of power and money; “who gets what, when, and how,” in Harold Lasswell’s phrasing). Organizations typically have buildings, leaders and staff, organization charts, budgets, etc. On the less formal side, institutions can be laws (pretty formal), practices, customs, and mutual understandings. These also help govern politics. These framing definitions should help you to interpret the prompt.

Your particular assignment for the third paper will depend on the role that you take in the simulation, which you will decide roughly midway through the semester.

Papers will be graded on clarity and professionalism of writing, persuasiveness of argumentation, and mastery of the subject.

Papers' Technical Requirements:

You are required to have a cover page, a maximum of five pages of text, double-spaced with normal margins and font size, then **end**notes, and finally a bibliography. On your cover page, you should briefly identify your topic: for the first paper, the historical choice (including its date) that you are going to analyze; for the second paper, the question from the list on the prompt handout that you are going to answer. Your cover page should also include an abstract that summarizes your argument in one or two sentences. Be sure also to include your name on the cover page.

You will organize your text with a strong introduction, several sections that methodically identify the problem and your proposed solution, and a strong, action-oriented conclusion that highlights what you want the United States – and who, specifically, within the U.S. government – to do. Within the first paragraph of the introduction, you will alert your reader to the core problem that you plan to address, explain why your reader should care, and suggest what you think your reader should do about the problem: grab your reader's attention and encourage her/him to read the rest of the paper. You should assume that your reader is smart but not informed about the particular problem that you are writing about and that your reader does not have any additional time to research the topic beyond reading your memo. Explain things clearly and simply. One natural organization of the body of your memo would be to have a section on the problem, then a section on your proposal, followed by a section rebutting counterarguments and then your conclusion. Your conclusion might explain who must do what to implement your solution, might offer a memorable soundbite, and/or might reiterate why the problem is pressing enough to command the effort to resolve. However you organize your paper, it must present your argument and rebut the counterarguments that a smart reader will naturally think of.

You may use any standard format for the endnotes and bibliography, as long as the format that you choose includes specific page numbers for references to source material that also has page numbers (web pages often do not have page numbers, but other source material, such as a book or a journal article, generally does).¹ Your bibliography should be an alphabetical list (by authors' last names) of all of the sources that you consulted in your research, including sources

¹ Here is the style guide for the journal *International Security*, revered by many in our business, that provides information on how to format notes and the bibliography:

that you did not refer to specifically in an endnote. Thus, your bibliography will include all of the sources in your endnotes and perhaps some additional ones.

All text pages after the end of page five may be ignored. It will harm your grade if you exceed the limit and we ignore your conclusion (or more) when we grade your paper.

Do not cheat by plagiarizing, copying, or re-using old work. Anything you look up, you must cite. See the syllabus for more information on cheating.

<https://www.belfercenter.org/journal-international-security/overview#!style-guide>. (accessed

8/19/19). For further reference, here is a good source that explains the MLA style, the Chicago Style, and several other alternatives:

https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/mla_style/mla_formatting_and_style_guide/mla_general_format.html (accessed 8/19/19).

National Security Policymaking
Fall 2021

Simulation Assignment (Will update when we get closer)

For the last major assignment of the course, each student will take on the role of an important person involved in preparing the U.S. national security budget. The real-world budget process is an enormous effort each year, with inputs from across the executive branch (and, within the Department of Defense, from each of the services and also civilians at the military department level followed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense) followed by a two-step Congressional process (authorization and appropriations). To make the simulation manageable and to emphasize those parts of the process that students can most reasonably simulate without access to classified information and detailed cost models, we will focus on the programming stage within the Department of Defense process and on the authorization stage in Congress. We will focus on the portion of the budget related to strategic nuclear modernization. In terms of class-time activities, we will allocate one day to the internal executive branch programming process and then a second day to a mock Congressional authorization hearing to discuss the budget proposal that we presume would have followed from the programming decisions made after the simulation's first day.

“Programming” is a stage of the Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System (PPBE) (discussed in chapter 4 of your SGT book). General information on PPBE is available at <http://acqnotes.com/acqnote/acquisitions/ppbe-overview>, among other places. Overall, the process begins when the Secretary of Defense, working in consultation with the Combatant Commanders and the Intelligence Community, develops a classified document called the *Defense Planning Guidance*, which describes the threats and opportunities facing the United States. The “planning” stage, heavily influenced by the Combatant Commanders, then develops a set of responses to that guidance, including military operational plans. For the Department to train and equip the military forces needed to execute those plans, the results of the planning stage need to be translated into specific programs that can be funded each year, so “programming” is the stage of the defense policy process when the Department of Defense thinks of a list of programs to fund. So when we say that the simulation emphasizes programming, what we mean is that it generally asks students to prepare a list of strategic nuclear programs that the Department would like Congress to fund next year. You will then present and debate those programs in a stripped-down, simulated Congressional hearing.

Our simulation will include up to 31 roles in the process, depending on enrollment. Some students will have a role to themselves, while others will be members of teams that together constitute an important player in the defense policy process. Within the teams, we expect each student on the team to develop a particular expertise that contributes to the team's overall policy input. The simulation will require you to do some research to understand the issues involved in strategic nuclear modernization as well as to understand the particular role to which you have been assigned. This research should include investigating relevant web sites (the government puts a lot of information online), but it also should involve reading reports (e.g., from think tanks and advocacy groups) and academic (or in some cases journalistic) books and articles.

You will have a role in the interactive, oral part of the simulation, and you also will write a five-page white paper (or five pages of a longer, group white paper) related to the simulation.

Because various activities in the simulation take place in a particular sequence, a few of the written assignments will be due earlier than the others; some white papers will not be due until the last class meeting. And as is the case in the real world of Washington policy-making, the various roles will involve different levels of time crunch and different levels of real-time adjustment and on-the-fly decisionmaking.

The first step in the simulation will be for the members of the team that is role-playing the U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) to submit a team paper that explains the nuclear posture, threats, and opportunities facing the United States. This document should draw in significant part from the unclassified Nuclear Posture Review, which was most recently released in October 2022

<https://media.defense.gov/2022/Oct/27/2003103845/-1/-1/1/2022-NATIONAL-DEFENSE-STRATEGY-NPR-MDR.PDF> (includes the NPR). Some analyses:

<https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF12266> ; <https://fas.org/publication/2022-nuclear-posture-review/> . The prior version came out in February 2018

(<https://dod.defense.gov/News/SpecialReports/2018NuclearPostureReview.aspx>). The STRATCOM team will have to use other sources, too (e.g., the Congressional Research Service reading on nuclear modernization assigned for the entire class to read, the latest version of the *National Security Strategy of the United States*, etc.). The document that the STRATCOM team prepares for our class should serve as the equivalent of the nuclear part of the *Defense Planning Guidance* for our simulation. (For those of you who are especially curious defense-policy nerds, the National Archives has posted a set of redacted documents that were part of the discussion of the controversial 1992 DPG:

<https://www.archives.gov/files/declassification/iscap/pdf/2008-003-docs1-12.pdf>.) The STRATCOM team members who write the DPG segment will have an oral role in the first day of the simulation (explained below). Another member of the STRATCOM team should work closely with the other members on developing the content of the simulated DPG section, but that additional member will be involved in the second day of the oral part of the simulation and will write his/her own five-page white paper that will be due that day.

The simulated DPG section will serve as input for the teams from the Air Staff, the Navy Staff, the Army Staff, and the Space Force Staff, triggering their work on programming requests. In effect, we are skipping over the “planning” stage of PPBES and going right from the overall guidance to programming, where we expect teams to consider the case for funding major programs including (but not limited to) the *Columbia*-class ballistic missile submarine, the B-21 bomber, the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent (a.k.a. Minuteman Replacement), and the B61-12 Life Extension Program to develop and deploy a new U.S. nuclear warhead. We will also have another team participate in the programming process, in a deviation from real-world practice: a team from a made-up composite of the Department of Energy, the National Nuclear Security Administration, and the nuclear laboratories (e.g., Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore, and Sandia). The Department of Energy is responsible for the actual development of nuclear bombs and some related systems, and DoE has its own budget process separate from the DoD budget process, but we wanted to be sure to fold DoE’s interests into our simulation, so we are accepting a small level of artificiality by making up a DoE programming team.

The members of the programming staff teams (Air Staff, Navy Staff, Army Staff, Space Force Staff, and DoE/NNSA/labs) will provide briefings on the first day of the simulation. Each briefing will be a tightly focused **four minutes** on a specific aspect of the programming proposal – coordinated with the other team members so that the composite of the various presentations makes a coherent overall proposal from each

staff. Each staff member will also write a five-page white paper justifying his/her programming proposal in detail, with appropriate formatting and references (endnotes), also due that day. These white papers *must be turned in on time*: we will distribute them on Sakai to your classmates so that they can serve as inputs to other students' preparation for the simulated Congressional hearing.

Three other teams will participate actively on the first day of the simulation: the Pentagon's Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE), the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the STRATCOM team that prepared the DPG excerpt. Each member of these teams will have **five minutes** to pursue a line of questioning to one or more of the programming request briefers (recognizing that the five minutes includes the amount of time that the person being questioned has to answer – so it may be difficult to fit in questions to more than one brifer). Each will have to prepare a basic outline of his/her questions in advance but will have to adapt them slightly on the fly to make them relevant to the specific briefings that have been offered in the class-time simulation. Members of the STRATCOM group who wrote the mock Nuclear Posture Review will focus their questions on how (and whether) the programming requests address the specific threats and opportunities identified in the DPG/NPR document. Members of the CAPE group will focus their questions on how the various programming requests might form an integrated budget: which proposals are substitutes, how the Department of Defense should make trade-offs among the various desired nuclear programs, and whether the cost projections for the various programs mentioned in the briefings are reasonable and what might happen if those cost projections are wrong. Members of the OMB group will focus their questions on how the programming proposals can remain consistent with the president's overall budget proposal: OMB is the organization that injects a level of concern about the deficit and about trade-offs between defense and civilian spending accounts into the defense policy process. The students on these teams need to know enough about the issues in the strategic nuclear modernization to ask sensible questions. Each member of the CAPE and OMB teams should develop some expertise on a particular substantive area, and the team members should coordinate in choosing those roles so that together they can cover the full range of important issues.

The first-day questioners who have not yet written papers – that is, those from the CAPE and OMB groups – are then responsible for writing two integrated proposals that the Department of Defense will take to Congress on the second day of the simulation. The CAPE group will make appropriate trade-offs among the various staff programming proposals in light of the Nuclear Posture Review and their anticipation of overall budget constraints. We do not expect every program discussed in the first day of the simulation to make it into CAPE's integrated proposal; the proposal document must explain why some programming requests were selected but others were not. Separately, the OMB team will develop the actual proposal for Congress, in light of the president's priorities and the overall level of defense spending that the president would like to submit to Congress. The team will, of course, make up the spending cap for strategic forces, and the team will not be working with real program cost estimates but instead only with a roughly accurate sense of what can fit in an "increased" or "full mobilization" or "flat" or "cut" defense budget. But the OMB team's written product will have to explain its justification for the overall budget picture and how that affects what programs proposed by the various staffs on the first day of the simulation can actually be taken forward as a proposal to Congress. The CAPE and OMB teams should discuss their thoughts about the proposals in a cross-team meeting, but they do not need to formally "coordinate" on each other's documents – that is, the two teams do not have to formally approve and sign off on each other's documents. Each member of the CAPE and OMB teams is responsible for roughly five pages of text in the proposal documents and also for contributing to the overall integration and editing process to produce those documents; all team members will receive the same overall group grade

for the teams' products. The CAPE and OMB papers are due at 9:00 am on the Monday before the 2nd day of the simulation. We will post the PDFs of those submissions on Sakai so that everyone involved in the second day of the simulation can read them in advance and use them as final inputs to their preparation for day 2 of the simulation.

The second day of the simulation will feature testimony before Congressional authorizers on the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. In reality, these committees meet separately, and each develops its own version of the National Defense Authorization Act, but for purposes of creating a manageable simulation, we will proceed as if they have a combined (joint) hearing on strategic nuclear modernization. The day will begin with prepared testimony about the programming request from STRATCOM, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Each person testifying will have **four minutes** to present his/her part of the overall team's pitch for a total of twelve minutes of class time. The students role-playing the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should also submit five-page white papers supporting their testimony, drawing from their research, from the programming papers submitted by classmates on the first day of the simulation, and from the budget proposals created by the CAPE and OMB teams. The SecDef and CJCS papers are due at the start of class on the day of the briefing.

Five other students, acting as representatives from important interest groups that have been called to testify before the Congressional committee, will then each present a **four-minute** statement about the nuclear modernization program. These interest group representatives will role-play experts from groups such as Northrop Grumman, the Heritage Foundation, the Nuclear Threat Initiative, the Cato Institute, and a group that we have made up for simulation purposes called Catholics for Nuclear Abolition (Catholics for Nuclear Abolition is a reasonable evolution from past U.S. Catholic activism on nuclear issues in light of Pope Francis' recent statements about nuclear weapons). Each interest group presenter will also prepare a five-page white paper supporting her/his testimony; the interest group white papers are due on the day of the presentations

Eight students role-playing Congressional leaders will then each have **five minutes** to pursue a line of questioning to one or more of the students who testified (again recognizing that the five minutes includes the amount of time that the person being questioned has to answer – so it may be difficult to fit in questions to more than one briefer). As with the STRATCOM, CAPE, and OMB participants from the first day of the simulation, these questioners need to know enough about the issues in the strategic nuclear modernization to ask sensible questions. They should come to the second day of the simulation with an outline of their planned questions but also prepared to adjust on the fly to what the presenters actually say. The Congressional leaders' white papers must explain and justify their line of questioning. They must have appropriate references and should conclude by recommending how the answers to the questions that they asked should be incorporated into the final budget resolution passed by Congress.

NOTE THESE TIMES PER SPEAKER MAY BE ADJUSTED DEPENDING ON ENROLLMENT

RESULTS !!!! NAME (NAMES, if TEAM): The Roles for the Simulation

Day 1	Day 2
Air Staff— 3 students FLICK; PHILIPS	Secretary of Defense— 1 student ERHARDT
Navy Staff— 2 students FARREL; VULIN	CJCS— 1 student SPEES
Army Staff— 1 student GALLAGHER	STRATCOM— 1 student MARTINEZ
Space Force Staff— 1 student PATTERSON	
DoE/NNSA/Labs— 1 student BENDER	Northrop Grumman— 1 student STEFANICK
	Heritage Foundation— 1 student BRENNAN
CAPE— 2 students KEARNEY; RAMP	Nuclear Threat Initiative— 1 student G. JONES
OMB— 2 students VELOTTA; CALCANO	Catholics for Nuclear Abolition— 1 student BROWN
STRATCOM— 3 students CARTER; GEAHIGAN; HILLEN	Cato Institute— 1 student MELLOR
	Senator Tom Cotton— WHELAN
	Senator Deb Fischer
	Senator Jack Reed— CARRANZA
	Senator Elizabeth Warren— WERNER
	Representative Adam Smith FERNANDES
	Representative Jim Cooper— ORSIC
	Representative Liz Cheney— WARD
	Representative Mike Rogers

INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the simulation instructions in the syllabus. Then please circle your preferred role. Feel free to submit pre-formed teams for the multi-students roles. For teams, put all your names at the top of the sheet.

Please print this out and bring the completed form to class Thursday Oct. 14th.