

POLS: 30210

U.S. National Security Policymaking: History, Institutions, and Statecraft
Department of Political Science and Notre Dame International Security Center
[Fall 2019 – T/Th 9:30-10:45 am, DeBartolo 120]

Version: August 22, 2019

Instructors:

Daniel Lindley

2170 Jenkins and Nanovic Halls

Office Hours: Wednesday 1:30-15:00; Thursday 15:30-17:00

[email] dlindley@nd.edu

[o] 574-631-3226

Eugene Gholz

2027 Jenkins and Nanovic Halls

Office Hours: Tuesdays 11:00-12:00 and 13:00-15:00

[email] egholz@nd.edu

[o] 574-631-3156

Teaching Assistant:

Alec Hahus

Office Hours: Monday 12:00-15:00

[email] shahus@nd.edu

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. In it, 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 theoretical 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 theoretical 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.

Areas of expertise of involved faculty:

The course will be taught by the following faculty:

Daniel Lindley is Associate Professor of Political Science and director of the NDISC Undergraduate International Security Certificate Program. Lindley's book, *Promoting Peace with Information: Transparency as a Tool of Security Regimes*, was published by Princeton University Press in 2007. He has published and spoken on U.N. peacekeeping, internal and ethnic conflict, the Concert of Europe, the Cyprus problem and Aegean security, and pre-emptive and preventive war, with articles in: *Contemporary Security Policy*, *International Studies Perspectives*, *Security Studies*, *International Peacekeeping*, *Defense and Security Analysis*, *Hellenic Studies*, and *PS: Political Science and Politics*. Lindley was the founding Director of the Center for Undergraduate Scholarly Engagement (CUSE) at Notre Dame, and has worked for Congressman Ratchford, two arms control research and lobby groups (CDI and FAS), and the foreign policy study section of the Brookings Institution think tank. Lindley's research focuses on causes of war and peace.

Eugene Gholz is an associate professor of political science. He works primarily at the intersection of national security and economic policy, on subjects including innovation, defense management, and U.S. grand strategy. From 2010-2012, he served in the Pentagon as Senior Advisor to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base

Policy. He is the coauthor of two books: *Buying Military Transformation: Technological Innovation and the Defense Industry*, and *U.S. Defense Politics: The Origins of Security Policy*. Much of his recent scholarship focuses on energy security. He is chair of the international security section of the International Studies Association and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations; he previously held faculty positions at the University of Texas at Austin, Williams College, the University of Kentucky, and George Mason University; and his Ph.D. is from MIT.

They will be assisted this year by Alec Hahus, a Ph.D. student in political science at the University of Notre Dame. Alec is a graduate member of NDISC and the Kellogg Institute, as well as a fellow at the Nanovic Institute. At Notre Dame, he studies international relations and comparative politics. He received his B.A. from Centre College and his M.A. from the University of Chicago. He previously interned at the Hudson Institute Center for Political-Military Analysis, researching Russian hybrid tactics and the US alliance network in Southeast Asia. Most recently, he was employed as an intelligence analyst for Pinkerton Consulting and Investigations.

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. Participation in discussion is not mandatory due to the size of the class, but we have found that there is generally a positive correlation between participation and the level of the student's grade. Regular attendance is important because the lectures will cover material beyond the readings. In addition, while this will not be primarily a current events class, you should read about national security affairs in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Economist*, or a source of similar quality throughout the semester. We will discuss current events that relate to the course to help you develop a basic familiarity with important contemporary issues and to show the connections between course material and the vital issues of the day. In other words, if you want to do well in this class, do all of the readings, attend every lecture, and read the newspaper regularly!

Grading Rubric: Your grade will be based on five things:

Take Home Policy Memo #1 = 20%

Take Home Policy Memo #2 = 20%

Simulation Team Grade = 10%

White Paper = 25%

Weekly quizzes/talk responses = 25% (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 TA, one of the professors, any special counseling and advising services, etc., as appropriate. Incompetent, negligent, or non-existent work will receive an F.

The weekly quizzes will take five minutes at the start of class. Each one will cover the reading assignments since the previous quiz. 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-.

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 2019 schedule is at: <https://ndisc.nd.edu/news-events/events/>). 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 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 XXXX from your quiz grade.

We will grant extensions for legitimate reasons, including illness of the student or in the student's family. 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. *Faits accomplis* (turning something in late without permission) beat the alternative of not handing anything in, but they reflect poorly on you and insult us. We will adjust grades on *faits accomplis* and 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 and unauthorized multiple submissions of work for assignments), 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 footnotes or endnotes to give credit for direct quotes, paraphrased quotes, or borrowed ideas. We will explain how to use footnotes and endnotes in class and in handouts. If you don't know what footnotes or endnotes are, ask! 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. Do not quote or paraphrase without giving credit in footnotes or endnotes, regardless of your source, including online articles, books, and other print sources.

Wikipedia and other general-interest encyclopedias are not appropriate sources for college-level work, although those sources may be useful for quick, initial familiarization with a topic before you begin your more serious research.

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. That is a more-than-\$60,000 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.

There are several links that explain citations and how to use them at this link, under Writing: <http://www.nd.edu/~dlindley/handouts/handoutlinks.html>

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-lecture-or-meeting.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.

Class Readings: We will be using two books available through Amazon.com or the university bookstore: Allan R. Millett, Peter Maslowski, and William Feis, *For the Common Defense: A Military History of the United States from 1607 to 2012* [3rd ed.] (New York: The Free Press, 2012) and Harvey M. Sapolsky, Eugene Gholz, and Caitlin Talmadge, *U.S. Defense Politics: The Origins of Security Policy* [3rd ed.] (London: Routledge, 2017). 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

8/27/19: Introduction to the Course; The Constitutional Basis for American Defense Policy [Lindley]

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

8/29/19: Film, *The Battle for Marjah*, [Hahus]

- Read the film guide before coming to class (on Sakai).
- You will watch the first 73.5 minutes in class; watch the remaining 14 minutes on your own before the next class session: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b9Pq5JZ2Fd8>

9/3/19: Film discussion [Lindley]; the Role of the Military in Building the New American State [Gholz]

- Millett, Maslowski, and Feis, chapter 5.

9/5/19: The Civil War and Saving the Union [Lindley]

- Millett, Maslowski, and Feis, chapters 6-7.

In-class Quiz

9/10/19: The Spanish-American War and the Birth of an American Empire [Gholz]

- Millett, Maslowski, and Feis, chapter 9

9/12/19: Writing Policy Memos [Gholz] and A Great Power in the Great War [Lindley]

- Adam Garfinkle, *Political Writing: A Guide to the Essentials* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2012), pp. 141-47.
- Millett, Maslowski, and Feis, chapter 11.
- 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.

In-class Quiz

9/17/19: World War II [Gholz]

- Millett, Maslowski, and Feis, chapters 13-14.

9/19/19: The Cold War [Gholz]

- Millett, Maslowski, and Feis, chapters 15-16.

In-class Quiz

9/24/19: The Vietnam War and the Media [Lindley]

- Millett, Maslowski, and Feis, chapters 17-18.

Part II: Institutions and Processes

9/26/19: The President and Public Opinion [Gholz]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 10.
- Richard J. Stoll, "The Guns of November: Presidential Reelections and the Use of Force, 1947-1982," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 28, Issue 2 (1984): 231-46.

Memo #1 Due

10/1/19: Congress and Interest Groups (Case Study: Veterans) [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapters 9, 13.

10/3/19: The Pentagon and the Office of the Secretary of Defense [Gholz]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 4.

In-class Quiz

10/8/19: Who's In the Military? [Gholz]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 5.

10/10/19: The Services and Doctrine [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 6.
- Barry R. Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), chapter 1 (pp. 13-33).

In-class Quiz

10/15/19: Civil-Military Relations [Hahus]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 3.
- Peter Feaver, "The Civil-Military Relations Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces and Society* Vol. 23, No. 2 (Winter 1996): 149-178.

10/17/19: The Intelligence Community and Threat Assessment [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 11.
- U.S. Congressional Research Service, "Renewed Great Power Competition: Implications for Defense—Issues for Congress," Updated August 5, 2019.
- Erik J. Dahl, *Intelligence and Surprise Attack: Failure and Success from Pearl Harbor to 9/11 and Beyond* (Georgetown University Press, 2013), chapter 1. (pp. 6-26)
- Skim: Richard K. Betts, "Surprise Despite Warning: Why Sudden Attacks Succeed," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 95, No. 4 (Winter 1980-81), pp. 551-572.

In-class Quiz

Fall Break – No Class 10/22/19 – 10/24/19 [Must be signed-up for simulation teams by now]

10/29/19: Homeland Security [Lindley]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 12.

10/31/19: The Defense Budget [Lindley]

- President Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Farewell Radio and Television Address to the American People," January 17th, 1961 at:
https://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/all_about_ike/speeches/farewell_address.pdf
- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 7.

In-class Quiz

11/5/19: Acquisition and Innovation [Gholz]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 8.
- Michael E. Brown, *Flying Blind: The Politics of the U.S. Strategic Bomber Program* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), chapter 9 (pp. 305-47).

Part III: Statecraft

11/7/19: Nuclear Weapons 101 [Lindley]

- Fact Sheets:
 - Union of Concerned Scientists, “How Do Nuclear Weapons Work?”
<https://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear-weapons/how-do-nuclear-weapons-work#.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-non-proliferation-technical-primer/>

Memo #2 Due

11/12/19: 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.
- Robert Jervis, "Deterrence and Perception," *International Security*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Winter 1982-83), pp. 3-30.

11/14/19: Simulation Team Meetings

11/19/19: Strategy/Grand Strategy [Gholz]

- Sapolsky, Gholz, and Talmadge, chapter 2.

11/21/19: Ground Combat [Gholz]

- Stephen Biddle, *Military Power: Explaining Victory and Defeat in Modern Battle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), chapter 3 (pp. 28-51).
- Daryl G. Press, "Lessons from Ground Combat in the Gulf: the Impact of Training and Technology," *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Fall 1997), pp. 137-47.

In-class Quiz

11/26/19: Asymmetric Warfare, Counterinsurgency, and Peacekeeping [Lindley]

- Richard K. Betts, "The Delusion of Impartial Intervention," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 73, No. 6 (November/December 1994).
- Barry R. Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Spring 1993), pp. 27-47 (skim the case studies).
- Headquarters, Department of the Army, *Insurgencies and Countering Insurgencies*, FM3-24 (May 2014), Cover to 1-14; 1-19 to 1-22; 2-1 to 2-10; 3-1 to 3-5.

Thanksgiving Break – No Class 11/28/19

12/3/19: Air and Naval Operations [Gholz]

- Marshall L. Michel, III, *Clashes: Air Combat over North Vietnam 1965-1972* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1997), introduction and chapter 1 (pp. 1-39).
- Karl Mueller, "Strategies of Coercion: Denial, Punishment, and the Future of Air Power," *Security Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Spring 1998), pp. 182-228.
- Wayne Hughes, *Fleet Tactics: Theory and Practice*, 2nd edition (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1999), pp. 7-11, 17-39.

In-class Quiz

Simulation

12/5/19: Simulation Exercise – Part 1

12/10/19: Simulation Exercise – Part 2

12/12/19: Simulation Exercise – After Action Review

Final White Paper Due – Monday, December 16, at 12:30 PM (E.S.T.)

Policy Memo Assignments
POLS 30210
US National Security Policymaking
Professors Eugene Gholz and Dan Lindley
TA Alec Hahus

One of the goals of this course is to help students prepare for careers in national security, broadly defined. In your career (and in most careers), you will have to write policy memos recommending a course of action that addresses a policy problem (advocacy memos). Therefore, we are tasking you to write two policy memos. The first is due at the end of our section on History and the second is due at the end of our section on Institutions.

For the first, you are to write a policy memo for any of the historical topics covered in this section. You must write a recommendation/s for a policy choice the US did NOT make, and you can ONLY use information available at the time.

For the second, you are to make a recommendation/s 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” H. Lasswell). 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. You can make arguments about institutions that address both their formal and informal characteristics, and eligible institutions include (but are not limited to) the services, commands, and many agencies within the Department of Defense, each with its own identity, viewpoints and perspectives, customs, practices, and standard operating procedures; institutions also include organizations within the services (for example, in the Navy, submarines vs. surface warfare, and within surface warfare, aircraft carriers vs. the amphibious navy). We are also interested in relationships between or across institutions and organizations. How does the Navy interact with the Air Force, considering such issues as redundancy, stovepiping, centralization vs. decentralization, and so forth. Independent institutions may also cultivate parochial influences on procurement, war plans, strategy, etc.

In both cases, the topic is up to you. Open-ended topics are a wonderful invitation to the curious but quicksand to procrastinators.

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

Details:

Policy memos diagnose the causes of a problem and recommend solution/s. They must address two related sets of issues: PEST and SWOT. PEST stands for political, economic, social, and technological. SWOT stands for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

Use PEST, as relevant, to assess technical/scientific, social, political, etc. causes of problems. Also consider those factors, as appropriate, when you consider historical precedents for the situation that you are writing about. As part of your research, thinking, and outlining of your memo, you should consider all of the PEST possibilities, but they may not all be relevant to your particular topic, and you should only include the important ones in the memo that you write and turn in.

Once you develop a proposal to address the problem that you have identified, continue to use PEST factors, as relevant, in your SWOT analysis: assess the strengths and weaknesses of your proposals, including feasibility, costs, benefits, and expected utility. And as with your diagnosis of the problem, consider historical precedents as you develop your SWOT analysis of your proposed solution. One way to think about SWOT is that you are methodically considering the arguments for your proposal and also the counterarguments against it. You must discuss both in your memo. And of course you should not only identify the counterarguments but also attempt to rebut them or at least weigh them against the strength of your argument in a way that makes the case for the policy that you are advocating.

This is simpler than it sounds. Use relevant facts that bear on the problem and proposed solution/s, and weigh the costs and benefits of the solution. You probably do not have space to use every element of PEST and SWOT, nor are they all equally relevant to each topic. The bottom line is that your task is to persuade a policy reader through your analysis.

We have included links below (and on the Lindley webpage) to a number of handouts that are available on the web with recommendations for how to write good policy memos. The various memos differ in some of their language – in how they explain things like PEST and SWOT, if they use those particular acronyms – but the core ideas underlying the advice permeate all of the handouts. You will probably find the handouts helpful as you consider the assignment.

Use facts. Avoid assertions.

It will be very hard to be persuasive in 5 pages, but that is the point. Imagine your memo is going to a very busy president or superior. 5 pages, 5 minutes of your addressees time is all you have. Write well.

Technical Requirements:

You are required to have a cover page, a maximum of five pages of text, double-spaced, then endnotes, and finally a bibliography. On your cover page, you should include a header that

identifies your memo's addressee, author, subject, and date, along with an abstract that summarizes your memo in one or two sentences. Write your header on four lines, one each for "to:," "from:," "re:," and "date:." You will be creative in choosing an appropriate recipient for your memo: whom do you want to influence with your policy proposal? You will also be creative – within the bounds of plausibility – in considering the position of a person who might write such an advocacy memo – that is, who are you role-playing as an author? Be sure to include your real name on the cover page but also identify the role-playing position from which you are writing your memo. On the subject line, you will make clear to your recipient what your memo is about and why it is important – in just a few words that fit on a single line. And for the historical memo, include both the role-playing date in your header (for example, if you are writing about a civil war-era topic, it would be appropriate to date the memo in, say, 1861) and also somewhere else on the cover page the due date for the assignment.

You will organize your memo 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 your memo's recipient 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 memo. Given the sort of policy advocate that you are role-playing in these assignments, 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 (with paragraphs on PEST, as appropriate, in that section), then a section on your proposal (and its SWOT), followed by a section rebutting counterarguments and then your conclusion. Your conclusion might explain what your addressee needs to do to implement your solution, might offer a memorable soundbite to help your addressee "sell" the solution to others, and/or might reiterate why the problem is pressing enough to command your addressees attention and effort to resolve.

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

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:

<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).

authors' last names) of all of the sources that you consulted in your research, including sources 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.

You will need to do some independent research for this assignment, as none of our readings provides enough data to make a convincing argument that answers the above questions.

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.

How to Write Policy Memos
Advice from leading Universities
Dan Lindley, August 19, 2019, v. 1.3b

Main source:

*Harvard Kennedy School: https://shorensteincenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/HO_Herman_Policy-Memos_9_24_12.pdf (accessed 8/19/19). Good general advice and detailed explanations of PEST and SWOT. [FWIW, this handout is also used at Stanford] You need not make PEST and SWOT tables or include such tables in the paper that you turn in.

Secondary, optional sources:

*Duke:

<https://twp.duke.edu/sites/twp.duke.edu/files/file-attachments/policy-memo.original.pdf> (accessed 8/10/19). From Duke, with good writing advice and some good mini-examples. Has a characterization of academic writing on p. 2 that I do not agree with: specifically, we strongly recommend *against* putting your most important point/s last.

*MIT:

<https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/36824/11-479Spring-2004/NR/rdonlyres/Urban-Studies-and-Planning/11-479Spring-2004/9CE4ACA2-EC3D-4C1D-91CC-27971E27DCF5/0/pmwriting.pdf> (accessed 8/19/19). Solid writing advice and a full length example. Note that our assignment supercedes anything written in these handouts re: formatting and anything else that we specifically mention in our assignment.

*University of Southern California:

<http://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/policymemo> (accessed 8/19/19). More good advice plus references to yet more advice on policy memos - including the MIT link, above.

*Syracuse Maxwell School:

<http://wilcoxen.maxwell.insightworks.com/pages/275.html> (accessed 8/19/19). Great examples of good and bad writing.

Why not more, now even more optional? You might want these references if and when the policy world comes your way:

Canadian International Development Research Centre:

<https://www.idrc.ca/sites/default/files/idrcpolicybrief toolkit.pdf> (accessed 8/19/19). Powerpoint-type presentation, but way too long at 37 pages!

Harvard Kennedy School:

https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/hks-communications-program/files/lb_how_to_write_pol_mem_9_08_17.pdf (accessed 8/19/19).

More on PEST and SWOT here: <http://creately.com/blog/diagrams/swot-analysis-vs-pest-analysis/> (accessed 8/19/19).