The MIT Security Studies Program (SSP) is a graduate-level research, public service, and educational activity affiliated with the MIT Center for International Studies for its research and public service work, and with the MIT Political Science Department for its graduate training. Within MIT, both the Center for International Studies and the Political Science Department report to the Dean of the School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, currently Deborah K. Fitzgerald. Included among its faculty, researchers, and students are social scientists, natural scientists, and engineers.

Barry R. Posen, the Ford Professor of International Relations at the MIT Political Science Department, is the Director of SSP. The Associate Director is Dr. Owen Cote, Jr., a Principal Research Scientist at MIT. Joli Divon Saraf is the Assistant Director and Program Manager. The Program has a core membership of 11 MIT faculty members and senior researchers. Approximately 30 graduate students are affiliated with the Program, almost all of whom are doctoral candidates in political science. In addition, more than 25 senior advisors, research affiliates, and military officers are associated with the Program, as well as four full-time and part-time administrators. Taken together, these categories of affiliates make SSP one of the largest academic programs specializing in security studies in the United States.
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The Security Studies Program, born as the Defense and Arms Control Studies Program, is nearly 30 years old. We produce two things: people and knowledge. The people are experts in national and international security. They work to broaden and deepen knowledge about the political control of military force, the avoidance of war where possible, and the achievement of victory when necessary.

Our records tell us that we have graduated nearly 72 MS students and 95 PhDs. They have pursued careers in government, think tanks, academia, and the private sector.

SSP faculty and senior researchers have produced books, articles, and reports about nuclear arms control, the general problem of war, the sources of military power, regional security problems, and U.S. national security policy. Our graduates have themselves published MS theses, PhD dissertations, books, and articles. This is a vast outpouring of work, the most recent of which is enumerated later in this report. Books by our recent graduates which began as dissertations are now prominently and proudly displayed in our foyer. These books are widely recognized in academic and policy circles.

Our teaching, research, and writing are motivated by a handful of premises:

• War is an extension of politics. Politics causes wars. Policy must be the governing force.

• War is increasingly destructive and complex. Policy cannot govern if politicians and their advisors do not have a deep understanding of how military forces work. This deep understanding of military forces includes the nature of the organizations and their members, the conduct of operations, and the technology of weaponry, command and control, and intelligence.

• Nuclear weapons are special. They deserve sustained and significant analytic attention.

• War is a costly and uncertain business, even for very great powers. It is preferable to achieve national ends without fighting, though the threat of fighting is a key diplomatic tool.

• Follow the money. Security policy is, in part, about the setting of priorities. These priorities should be reflected in the allocation of national security resources. If they are not, then policy is not governing diplomacy, preparation for war, or the conduct of war, and therefore the country has a problem.

• Military professionals are our partners. A healthy civil-military relationship, however, requires arguments with them. Civilians and soldiers bring different perspectives to the problem of national security policy. Each perspective makes an important contribution to an integrated national security policy.

• Other nation states and other groups may view their interests differently from how we view their interests. They may generate military power differently from how we would generate military power, and assess their capabilities differently from how we might do so. We should endeavor to understand adversaries, allies, and neutrals.

• Diplomatic and military history is important. The experience chronicled and interpreted by our history colleagues was gained with the expenditure of much blood and treasure. We should learn what we can from it.

• Good strategy depends on good social science. If we cannot predict, even if roughly, then we cannot prescribe responsibly.
The public debate on the comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran—the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA)—achieved a legislative culmination point when the last Senatorial vote needed to sustain a Presidential Veto was assured. Intense political and policy analytic debate about the JCPOA will no doubt continue, as will legislative action aimed either to enhance it, to destroy it, or to ensure through multiple overlapping initiatives that U.S.-Iran relations remain adversarial.

This is not the place, and I am not the person, to review in detail the technical parameters of the agreement. I support it, and perhaps that colors what I suggest below. I was struck, however, by larger issues that lie behind the array of objections raised to the agreement. These larger issues are important in their own right, and neither the opponents nor the supporters of the agreement chose to air them. Instead, as one might expect in an intense public political fight over a complex arms control agreement, the sides fought the campaign in a series of tactical battles over particular provisions of the agreement, or particular problems that it does not address. That said, these larger issues ought to be of importance to those of us whose job it is to address them in our scholarly work. A bit more purchase on these problems might be of utility going forward.

Three general questions hover above the Iran nuclear debate: What is the purpose of arms control? What is the nature of war as a political tool? How does diplomacy work?

Many criticisms of the arrangement took the following form. “Iran is an adversary of the U.S., of Israel, and of the Arab states; it is prone to violence; it practices deceit. Therefore, why would one make any deals with it? We should not sign any arms control agreement that Iran would sign.” This view was not unknown during the Cold War. The main purpose of arms control, however, is to regulate the competition with one’s adversary. Why would you want to do this? Advocates suggested that one might seek two kinds of ‘stability’ in an arms control arrangement: crisis stability and arms race stability. The first aimed to make trigger fingers a bit less itchy in crisis; the second aimed to save a few bucks by avoiding the mutual construction of weapons that would in the end make neither party much better off, either weapons that probably would not work, or weapons that were simply superfluous. We probably had more success with the second than the first in the Cold War. Neither project was a huge success, but stability was the point.

One of our first principles here at SSP is that nuclear weapons are special. Anything you can do to limit superfluous numbers and/or constrain first strike incentives in crisis, is worth a bit of effort. You may fail. The Iran deal is especially juicy from a U.S. point of view because it helps ensure that Iran cannot become a nuclear weapons state for a decade or more. The JCPOA is a nonproliferation agreement, banning even the materials for a weapon for one party rather than limiting weapons for two, but it shares a similarity with traditional arms control because of the specificity of the limits on Iran’s nuclear infrastructure and the systematic attention to verification, as well as the fact that the U.S. and its partners must make some reciprocal concessions. Given that decision makers believe that the U.S. has important strategic interests in the greater Middle East, sustaining an ability to protect those interests without the risk of a nuclear explosion is a big gain. Those who believe that Iran is inevitably a committed adversary of the U.S. and a threat to the status quo, ought to be pleased that the U.S. has another decade of escalation dominance in the region. Moreover, lengthening the time that it would take Iran to ‘break out,’ to convert its nuclear energy program into a useable weapon, also contributes to crisis stability. Given how long it would take during the first fifteen years of the agreement, a sudden confrontation with the U.S. ought not to precipitate a rush to the exits, as a rush cannot quickly yield a weapon. Similarly, the U.S. need not consider a preventive strike early in any crisis, because it would have more time to assess the situation. This is a new kind of crisis stability.

A second important question looming over the debate is how to think about large-scale military action, what many of us still quaintly refer to as ‘war.’ The President, in his less reserved moments of advocacy, accused opponents of the agreement of driving the U.S. to war. His interlocutors bridled at the accusation, though as I will suggest below, he was on firm ground. The accusation of moving us to war did not however, seem to produce much consideration of what a war might look like. When pressed senior commanders asserted their confidence in the ability of the U.S. military to handle Iran, and its nuclear energy program. And in an arithmetical sense, this is surely true. The U.S. has the aircraft and precision munitions (PGMs) to destroy whatever targets we know about, and given the 70 or 80 billion dollars we spend each year on intelligence of all sorts, we probably know about a lot of targets. This is, however, only the beginning of an assessment. PGMs can only destroy identified targets, and a few have probably escaped detection. Even explosions proximate to known targets do not always do the damage that is expected. The adversary occasionally moves a few important things before a strike. A few bits and pieces of the program will likely survive. But the most important thing about the Iranian program is that it lives in the minds of its scientists, engineers, and technicians. Unless many of them are killed, the program will have a tendency to grow back. Though a small number of Iranian scientists have been assassinated by someone, one seldom hears this larger scale remedy discussed, because to discuss it would raise profound political and indeed ethical issues, and actually to do it would be even more problematical. Advocates of a strike take refuge in the Israeli saying that you just have to keep coming back to “mow the lawn.” Is it a viable course for U.S. foreign policy to bomb another country every five years until it concedes that we determine its policies?

Beyond the necessarily limited decisiveness of a strike on Iran’s nuclear infrastructure is everything else one dimly knows about war. Our own soldiers often remind us that “the enemy gets a vote.” Iran can choose to retaliate at
the moment, or nurse its grudge. It can use ‘conventional weapons’ or it can use sabotage and subversion. It can reach for immediate large impact strikes with ballistic missiles, anti-ship missiles, and mines, or it can dribble out their strikes, aiming to keep the region roiled for a long time. Its air defense system can turn on its radars, fire all its surface to air missiles, and hope to bring down many U.S. aircraft, or they can play cat and mouse, like the Serbs did, prolonging the campaign. Iranian strikes will not close the Gulf nor cut off Saudi oil shipments, (as analysis done here at SSP has shown), but questions still arise. What if Iran gets lucky? What are the knock-on economic and political effects of even modest Iranian success? It is a staple of Iran threat assessment to discuss its proxies in the region. I doubt that these proxies would take big risks for Iran, but they might help Iran spread the pain and prolong the war. The U.S. now has more than 3500 advisors in Iraq, in close proximity to Shiite militias with good relations with Iranian intelligence; they are not invulnerable. These kinds of Iranian responses will not defeat the U.S., but they impose costs. Finally, how will the war be brought to an end? What remedies would the U.S. have if Iran simply refused to end hostilities?

War has other costs that are more difficult to demonstrate and measure-- political costs. The U.S. is already part of modern Iran’s history; the story they tell themselves about the U.S. role in their history helps the regime to rally political support. It sustains the commitment of its more ardent military defenders. A U.S. war against Iran would further entrench the politics of that country in favor of enduring competition. One ought not to be too sure how sustained western air attacks on Iran would be taken across the region. Arab regimes oppose the Iranian regime and would probably applaud. Not all Arab people would feel the same. Shiite Arabs would likely sympathize with Iran. We should remember, however, that at the outset of the insurgency against the U.S. in Iraq, Sunni and Shiite Arab fighters made common cause against us.

Finally, a peculiar view of diplomacy emerged in some criticisms of the agreement. As typically practiced, diplomacy is about compromise. Coalitional diplomacy is also about give and take among one’s own sovereign partners, who may not all have identical interests. Much of the criticism of the Iran agreement challenges the very notion of diplomacy. This is not unusual in the U.S.: even senior diplomats sometimes fall prey to the assumption that diplomacy is about the U.S. giving another country or leader a chance to surrender gracefully, before we crush them. Think back to our negotiations with Milosevic over Kosovo, or with Gaddafi or Assad. As these cases suggest, however, even actors much weaker than Iran do not view diplomacy as a surrender ceremony. Criticisms of the Iran nuclear agreement to the effect that it leaves Iran with enrichment capability, or that it returns to them financial resources that we have impounded, is essentially a criticism of diplomacy. Iran needed to be offered something to get it to constrain a program in which it had invested significant financial, human, and political capital. The agreement turned off much of the physical plant of Iran’s enrichment effort and constrains its growth for many years; most of its enriched uranium is surrendered; all of its physical plant is subjected to regular and intense scrutiny. For the duration of the agreement, Iran lives under the institutionalized threat of sanctions renewal in the event that it defects. The wider ramifications of the agreement also give each side something important. Iran gets to focus on its internal economic problems; the U.S. gets to practice hegemony in the greater Middle East without worrying much about nuclear risks.

U.S. diplomacy also needed to account for the interests of its own negotiating partners. Skeptics claim that the alternative to this deal “is a better deal.” It is more likely that, as the President suggested, the alternative to this deal is war. Why is that? The President knew what the New York Times only reported in early September: Russia, China, France, Britain, and Germany helped make the sanctions regime so onerous that Iran saw an interest in cutting a deal. The “better deal” that some think could be achieved would only be possible if the sanctions regime could be sustained indefinitely. In August, representatives of these countries sat down with undecided members of Congress to convey the message that they wanted a deal now, and that they would not continue to cooperate with the sanctions regime if the U.S. scotched it. Without their help, there is not enough pressure to get a better deal. The U.S. could of course try to pressure its partners to remain in the sanctions regime. But there is no guarantee that this would work, since these are all major economic powers themselves, and they have declared their interest in the settlement. Efforts to pressure them into sustaining sanctions would likely cost the U.S. something, in terms of side-payments and ill-will. Even if pressure worked, Iran could doubt the cohesion of such a fractious coalition. One way or the other, U.S. economic and/or political leverage on Iran would probably weaken. Iran would then likely resume work on improving the capabilities of its nuclear infrastructure; and the U.S. would be out of cooperative options to constrain it. Thus, the President’s argument that to abandon this deal is to raise the risk of war was fair.

Nuclear Arms Control is no panacea to an otherwise intense strategic competition, but given the risks posed by nuclear weapons, should we prefer to proceed without negotiation? War is sometimes a necessary tool, but it is more battle axe than rapier. If one plans to impose by force certain policies on a country with nearly 80 million nationalistic citizens, in an inherently unstable part of the world, does it make sense to assume that there will be a cheap and decisive outcome? Finally, ought one to expect diplomacy to be a surrender negotiation in the absence of victory in a bloody and destructive war? These are general questions that should affect not only the foreign policy of the U.S., but foreign policy period. We could do a better job answering these questions. But perhaps we could also do a better job explaining their importance to the wider public.
Independent Scholarship:
The Diffusion of Power

SSP views the diffusion of power, and its implications, to be the defining characteristic of international politics today. Important capabilities are spreading quickly to other actors—state, supra-state, and sub-state. We have argued this for several years. The National Intelligence Council’s *Global Trends 2030* shares our views. The relative gap between the United States and other powers and non-state actors is shrinking. Though it is dangerous to infer trends from a short period, the problems posed by increasingly capable states and groups have become more evident in Asia, the greater Middle East, and Europe in the past two years. Arguably economic problems, future fiscal issues and the political gridlock that characterizes U.S. domestic politics, may hasten this process, depending of course on how well others address similar challenges. How the diffusion of power is managed will critically affect relations among great powers, and the prospects for the peaceful development of weak or poor states. It will also affect the safety of millions of individuals around the globe. The Security Studies Program is well situated to explain these general trends in global politics, and to recommend specific policy measures to ameliorate the security risks that arise from these processes.

SSP is particularly strong in four related areas: understanding the vast geo-political shifts now underway in Asia, which carry considerable risk of a return to militarized great power competitions; controlling the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; designing strategies to deal with fragile states and the volatile politics they often generate, such as civil war, insurgency, and terrorism; and assessing how U.S. national security policy can best address all these challenges. We consider these to be the key security questions facing the U.S.
Nuclear Strategy and Statecraft

In 2014, Vipin Narang published his first book, *Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era: Regional Powers and International Conflict*, with Princeton University Press. He identifies the diversity of regional power nuclear strategies and develops both a theory for why states may select one strategy over another, and how those choices affect a state’s ability to deter conflict. His book provides in depth studies of the nuclear strategies of the six regional nuclear powers: China, India, Pakistan, France, South Africa, and Israel. He shows that contrary to conventional wisdom, the mere possession of nuclear weapons does not produce a uniform deterrent effect. Rather, deterrence power varies by nuclear strategy.

Narang also examined the case of India in greater depth in “Five Myths about India’s Nuclear Posture,” published in *The Washington Quarterly*. He pointed out that the last serious public study of India’s nuclear posture was performed over a decade ago. Since then, India has made significant changes to its assured retaliation nuclear posture, including institutionalizing its nuclear command and control structure and standing up a dedicated Strategic Forces Command. In addition to expanding the diversity of nuclear platforms, such as developing a submarine-based leg, some subset of India’s forces may be at a higher state of readiness than is traditionally understood, with implications for the safety and security of the arsenal.

In 2015, he published a second article in *The Washington Quarterly* analyzing the potential nuclear strategies emerging nuclear powers might adopt. Building on the theory from his 2014 book, he argues that if Iran were to ultimately acquire nuclear weapons, its domestic institutions and preferences would more likely lead it to look like India’s and China’s assured retaliation strategy, rather than Pakistan’s more aggressive first use strategy. He also analyzes North Korea’s nuclear strategy, arguing that China is the key actor in determining how aggressive North Korean nuclear strategy may be in the coming years.

Narang also gave several briefings to various U.S. government audiences on stability in South Asia, as well as broader regional power nuclear strategy. He also participated in several Track 1.5/2 dialogues between the U.S. Government and India and Pakistan on nuclear stability in South Asia.

Narang’s second book project moves away from nuclear strategy and posture back to his first interest: nuclear proliferation. While much of the literature focuses on why states pursue nuclear weapons, Narang’s current book project provides the first systematic study on how states choose to pursue nuclear weapons—their strategies of proliferation—and the impact those strategies have on the proliferation landscape. He identifies several strategies of nuclear proliferation, develops a theory for why nuclear pursuers might select one over the others, and explores the various ways in which these choices matter to the nuclear proliferation and nonproliferation landscape. In the past academic year, he presented work from this second book project at McGill University, Brown University, Harvard University’s Belfer Center, George Washington University’s Institute for Security and Conflict Studies, the University of Chicago, and Stanford University’s Center for International Security and Cooperation.

Gavin continues to be a senior fellow with both the Robert Strauss Center for International Security and Law and the Clements Center in National Security at the University of Texas and a senior advisor to the Nuclear Proliferation International History Project at the Woodrow Wilson Center. This year, he was named a senior fellow with the Managing the Atom project at Harvard, an adjunct senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security, an associate editor at International Security, and a member of the editorial board of the journal Security Studies. He hosted a major interdisciplinary conference on emerging scholarship in nuclear studies as part of his Carnegie Corporation and MacArthur Foundation project, the Nuclear Studies Research Initiative. With James Steinberg, Dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse, he launched The Carnegie International Policy Scholars Consortium and Network a major effort to assess graduate training in international affairs.

Jim Walsh conducts research and public outreach activities on nuclear proliferation, particularly on Iran and North Korea.

Iran
Dr. Walsh held discussions with U.S., British, and Iranian nuclear negotiators in 2014 and 2015, as well as with the President and Foreign Minister of Iran, President Obama’s National Security Council staff, and members of Congress. Walsh and his colleagues produced a series of private memos, op-eds, and longer papers on U.S.–Iranian relations and the prospects for a nuclear agreement. The New York Times recommended one of his co-authored reports in an article, “How to Get Smart on Iran.” Dr. Walsh also testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on how to assess negotiated nuclear agreement with Iran.

North Korea
Dr. Walsh pursued both scholarly and policy work on the topic of DPRK. Working with Dr. John Park and with the support of the MacArthur Foundation, Walsh explored the unintended consequences of U.S. financial sanctions against North Korea. He also met with North Korea’s ambassador to the United Nations and worked with the National Committee on North Korea to pursue engagement strategies with Pyongyang.

The Nonproliferation Implications of Laser Enrichment
Uranium enrichment is a key process for the production of both nuclear fuel and nuclear weapons. In 2012, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued its first commercial license to Global Laser Enrichment (GLE) for the development of a new laser-based uranium enrichment technology, known as SILEX. It did so without any systematic study of its impact on nuclear security. Dr. Walsh and Professor Scott Kemp of the Laboratory for Nuclear Security and Policy (LNSP) and the Nuclear Engineering Department received a grant from the MacArthur Foundation to explore and assess the nonproliferation implications of laser enrichment. The project represents a unique effort to leverage the perspectives and methodologies of two different disciplines on an issue of common interest and policy import.

Policy Engagement and Public Outreach
In the past year, Dr. Walsh met with senior U.S. government officials at the Department of State, Department of Defense, and other members of the executive branch. He also gave policy briefings to 13 members of Congress, including 7 Senators. In addition, he met and gave presentations to 67 Congressional staff. Dr. Walsh’s public engagement activities included 27 lectures and presentations to the foundation community, universities, U.S. military personnel, and the policy community. He joined National Public Radio’s Here and Now program as their contributor for international security, a program that draws more than 3 million listeners on a weekly basis. He published 9 editorials, including pieces for the Dallas Morning News and Reuters and in his capacity as a contributor to WBUR-NPR’s Cognescenti series. Dr. Walsh participated in 251 media interviews (e.g., CBS, Fox, CNN, NPR, and the BBC) and for international media spanning 33 countries.
Civil War and Identity Politics

Violent conflict in Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere persists, even as the United States seeks to prevent or minimize its overt involvement in such wars. Within SSP, Fotini Christia and Roger Petersen study specific dynamics in these important hot spots, while also developing broader theories of civil war, insurgency, and revolution.

Fotini Christia studies the ongoing conflicts in the broader Middle East and the unprecedented threat they pose to world order. The main purpose of her work is to better inform U.S. foreign policy in the region. To that effect, she uses a variety of sophisticated methods along with extensive fieldwork in diverse areas of the Muslim world, to offer an understanding of how cooperation emerges in violently contested environments, and what roles identity, material incentives, networks, and institutions play in that process.

Christia is currently working on a “big data” project that uses granular network data in an effort to understand collective action around violent and non-violent protests in the Muslim world. She is doing so using hundreds of millions of anonymized call data records from the period right before, during and after the Yemeni Arab Spring. She is supplementing her quantitative analysis, which is being done in conjunction with Stanford Computer Science Professor Jure Leskovec and his team, with analysis of qualitative materials recording the events and with interviews with Yemeni reformist protesters, as well as with regime supporters. Using the same data, she is also working with network scientist Ali Jadbabaei at MIT, on a project that tries to measure the effect of drone strikes on the levels of local mobile communication in Yemen. A general interest piece on the use of call data records to understand sociopolitical phenomena in Yemen, entitled “Yemen Calling: Seven Things Cell Data Reveal about Life in the Republic” appeared in Foreign Affairs in July 2015.

Christia is also embarking on a new project in Iraq, for which she was awarded one of the inaugural Andrew Carnegie Fellowships. This project focuses on Shi’a political attitudes and public opinion. Specifically, Christia intends to exploit the opportunity afforded by Shiite religious pilgrimage sites in southern Iraq, and particularly in the cities of Najaf and Karbala, to survey
observant Shiites both from Iran and from Iraq, and to inquire about their attitudes towards their respective governments, the West and the U.S., as well as their opinions on sectarian conflicts raging across the Middle East in Syria and Iraq, including the rise of ISIS and Iran’s nuclear program. The survey will be administered to a representative sample of 2000 Iraqi pilgrims and another 2000 Iranian pilgrims, for a total of 4000 male and female respondents in the politically active window of 20-50 years of age.

Finally, Christia is continuing her work on the effects on development aid on governance and economic wellbeing. In that regard, she is concluding her multi-year work on the topic in Afghanistan, along with co-authors Andrew Beath of the World Bank and Ruben Enikolopov of the New Economic School in Moscow, revising and resubmitting three articles already in the review process. These articles examine the effects of local institutions on the allocation of development resources, as well as the effects of development aid on governance and economic wellbeing.

Over the past twenty years, Roger Petersen mainly worked on issues relating to ethnic violence in Eastern Europe. His most recent book, Western Intervention in the Balkans: The Strategic Use of Emotion in Conflict won several awards, including the Association for the Study of Nationalities Joseph Rothschild Prize in Nationalism and Ethnic Studies, the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies Marshall Shulman Book, and the International Studies Association ENMISA (Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Migration Section) Distinguished Book Award.

Professor Petersen has now turned his attention to Iraq. Along with two SSP graduates (Austin Long and Jon Lindsay), Petersen is working on a book manuscript tentatively entitled “The Social Science Guide to the Iraq War.” Methodologically, this project breaks down the Iraq insurgency into its component parts and then builds up toward an understanding of the evolution of the insurgency as a whole. The empirical sections of the book will outline how a progression of strategies led to the larger outcomes of the conflict in terms of violence and state-building. By the end of the book, the authors intend to show that the Iraq war is better conceived of as multiple wars fought differently at different times and places with tremendous variation at local levels. The work explores how the interaction of coalition and insurgent strategies drove the course of these different sub-conflicts. In the course of the analysis, the book will confront the conventional wisdom about issues such as the impact of the U.S. troop “surge,” the role of ethnic cleansing, and effectiveness of political bargaining. The conclusions of this study will make some informed speculations about the future of insurgency and counterinsurgency.

Petersen also studies issues related to post-conflict reconciliation. Recently, he presented talks on this topic in a variety of settings including “Revenge or Reconciliation: Theory and Method of Emotions in the Context of the Colombia Peace Process,” International Conference on Citizenship Culture, Bogota Colombia; “Emotions and the Possibilities for Post-War Reconciliation,” Workshop on Human Security and War against Impunity, University of Leipzig; “Communal Separation in Baghdad: A Comparative Analysis,” Identity, Sovereignty, and Global Politics in the Building of Baghdad, Harvard University Graduate School of Design.
Asian Security

Beginning in the 1990s, SSP carefully cultivated faculty expertise on security in Asia. Richard Samuels and Taylor Fravel specialize in Japan and China, respectively, but their work addresses key trends in the region as a whole, as well as in international relations.

Richard J. Samuels is at work on several projects related to Japan and East Asian security. In 2013, Professor Samuels and co-author James Schoff wrote “Japan’s Nuclear Hedge: Beyond ‘Allergy’ and ‘Breakout’” in Strategic Asia 2013–2014, edited by Ashley Tellis and published by the National Bureau of Asian Research. The chapter has been updated and will appear in the fall 2015 issue of Political Science Quarterly, Tokyo places less faith in U.S. extended nuclear deterrence than it once did, Samuels and Schoff warn. They say the incentive and potential for Japan to develop nuclear weapons in response may rise.

Building upon his 2014 research into a hotly contested new state secrets law passed by Tokyo, he has begun a larger book project on the evolving Japanese intelligence community (IC) and how institutional changes are related to Japanese grand strategy. As a U.S. ally in a region in which relative power is shifting, Tokyo faces special challenges and actively realigning its intelligence capabilities and institutions. Japanese strategists are asking fundamental questions of U.S. capability and commitment. They wonder if Washington will have staying power in Asia, and are not sure of the answer.

In 2015 Samuels became an Einstein Visiting Fellow at the Free University of Berlin, where he has created a research group with support from the Einstein Foundation—two doctoral students and a postdoctoral researcher—to examine East Asian security issues. He will work with this group for three years, while visiting Berlin multiple times annually. The group will explore the regional and global consequences of Japan’s quiet hedge on U.S. power.

In 2015 Samuels also helped engineer a $5 million gift to endowment from the Japanese government for a fund to support the study of Japanese politics and diplomacy. Income from the endowment, announced by Prime Minister Abe Shinzo at MIT (http://newsoffice.mit.edu/2015/japanese-prime-minister-shinzo-abe-0427), will be used to assist SSP graduate students and to hire a senior research scientist who works on Japan and Asian security. Upon Samuels’ retirement, the fund will move to the MIT Department of Political Science and is earmarked to hire a new faculty member who works in this area.

In September 2014 Samuels was named a member of a bilateral group of senior scholars and leaders chaired by former U.S. Senate Majority Thomas Daschle, former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Dennis Hastert, former Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda, and former Keidanren Chairman Fujio Mitarai. The group met at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington in December 2014, and in Tokyo in May 2015.

Samuels made a number of presentations on Japanese politics and grand strategy this past year, including at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington, DC; Harvard University; the University of Pennsylvania; the Australian National University; the U.S. Naval War College; U.S.-Asia Centre, University of Western Australia; the University of Sydney; and George Washington University.


M. Taylor Fravel studies China’s foreign and security policies as well as the international relations of East Asia and U.S.-China relations. With unresolved territorial disputes and growing military capabilities, China is often viewed as the major power most likely to trigger a major crisis or war. Professor Fravel’s work aims to understand the conditions under which China may threaten or use force and the implications of such action for the region.

Two principal questions motivate Fravel’s research: First, when and why do leaders choose to use force or compromise in territorial disputes? As territorial disputes have been the most common issue over which states have gone to war, the answers to this question can improve our understanding of international security more generally. In the past year, Fravel has focused his efforts on China’s maritime disputes in the South China Sea over the Paracel and Spratly Islands and in the East China Sea over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands. In addition to speaking widely on the subject before a variety of academic and policy audiences, Fravel published two book chapters. The first, for the Oxford Handbook of the International
Relations of Asia, surveys all the territorial and maritime boundary disputes in Asia. The main conclusion is that this region is more primed for conflict over territory than any other. The second book chapter, for a volume on challenges facing China’s leaders, explored how China’s assertiveness in the South China Sea has upset China’s past “good neighbor” approach to East Asia.

The second question driving Fravel’s research: When and why do states pursue major change in their military strategies? Such strategies illuminate a state’s broader political objectives and how the state plans to use force to achieve them. Fravel is at work on the first book-length study of major changes in China’s military strategy since 1949. To better understand China’s past and future approaches to warfare, the book explores the three major changes in China’s national military strategy that were adopted in 1956, 1980, and 1993, as well as China’s naval and nuclear strategies. As part of this project, Fravel completed two journal articles. The first, co-authored with a former graduate student of the program, Christopher Twomey, used primary Chinese language sources to question the conventional view that China pursues an explicit strategy of “counter-intervention” to push the United States out of the region. The second article, for the China Brief, discussed how China’s 2015 white paper reveals that China officially altered its military strategic guidelines in 2014.

This past year, Fravel has also completed a major study of the future of China’s nuclear strategy. The study, which was co-authored with Fiona Cunningham, a graduate student in the program, will appear in the International Security. The study examines whether China will alter its long-standing nuclear strategy of assured retaliation in light of continued U.S. advancements in offensive and defense strategic capabilities. The study also examines the implications of China’s nuclear strategy for crisis stability between the United States and China.

Finally, Fravel participated in a joint study organized by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to examine the future of stability in East Asia. The final report, Conflict and Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region: A Strategic Net Assessment, examined five possible scenarios for developments in the region.

Together, Samuels and Fravel conducted a joint investigation of security dynamics in the region through a series of workshops. The first, held in collaboration with the Free University in Berlin, examined Japan’s role in East Asian security. The second, at MIT, examined the future of Japan’s grand strategy.
The Causes and Conduct of War

SSP pays special attention to the conduct of war and to its causes, one of the central puzzles of political science.

The U.S. national security establishment takes nuclear proliferation, weak states and civil wars, changing power relations in Asia, and the emergence or re-emergence of capable middle powers, as serious security threats that require focused diplomatic and military attention. The conceptual framework that holds together these U.S. efforts appears to be a bit ramshackle. The balance of means and ends seems unstable. And the ability of the U.S. national security establishment to juggle all these problems simultaneously—much less competently—is in doubt. SSP efforts to audit U.S. grand strategy fall into three areas: critiques of the conceptual framework; the development of systematic theories of international war; and the assessment of modern military power.

Barry R. Posen, completed Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy, which was published by Cornell University Press in June 2014. In Fall of 2015 the book went into its paperback printing. The book argues explicitly for a more cautious and considered U.S. approach to ensuring its national security, an approach that focuses on a small number of threats, and takes into account those political and military forces in the world that make it difficult for the United States to work its will. Books do not sell themselves: Professor Posen presented 16 talks and interviews about the book in the past year, and is gratified that he continues to receive invitations to speak about it. Given the rapid (re-) emergence this past year of real and imagined strategic challenges to the United States, Professor Posen expects to apply the analytic framework developed in the book to new problem areas. One active area in the last year has been the problem of how to deal with the rise of ISIL. Professor Posen has written short pieces on U.S. policy options, and appeared in the media to discuss them. In the coming year Professor Posen plans to work on three inter-related problems: the changed and changing character of how great and middle powers approach the use of military force; the nature of naval power in the 21st century; and the political dynamics of a plausibly emergent multipolar world.

Stephen Van Evera continues work on the causes of World War I and political science methodology.

Professor Van Evera is writing a book on “European Militaries and the Origins of the First World War.” Van Evera argues that before 1914 the militaries of Europe had massive influence in the halls of government. They used this influence to lobby hard for war, in a forceful way that would be unthinkable in western powers today. Eventually they wore down the resistance of civilian leaders, especially in Germany, Austria, Serbia and to a lesser extent Russia. European militaries also imbued civilian society with false belief that conquest was easy, war was beneficial, empires were valuable, others were hostile, and tactics of intimidation would win more friends than enemies. These misperceptions fueled the bellicose conduct of the major powers and primed Europe for war. Van Evera further argues that World War I was an inadvertent war, an accidental war, and a preemptive war. And he argues that while all European powers pursued fiercely competitive policies in 1914, Germany had the lion’s share of responsibility for the war. It was Germany [and client Austria] that sparked the July crisis and drove it over the edge to war. France and Russia also took belligerent steps in the summer of 1914, but were responding to German/Austrian aggressive moves. Van Evera’s book expands on a book chapter he published last year in Richard N. Rosecrance and Steven E. Miller, eds., A Fateful Shadow: The Origins of World War I and Great Power Conflict in the 21st Century (MIT Press, 2014).

Van Evera is also developing a manuscript on “natural experiments in history.” He argues that some events in history have attributes of controlled experiments, and that strong causal inferences can therefore be drawn from these events. We should focus our research on identifying and exploring such events. They are “case studies on steroids.”

Owen Cote studies military operations and doctrine. He has completed two chapters for a book he is writing on the effects of technology on modern, great power air and naval warfare. Several themes have emerged. First, the same technology often has dramatically different effects in different great power naval competitions. For example, before World War II, the diesel submarine was widely perceived to favor the weaker naval power over the stronger one because diesel submarines could directly
threaten the stronger power’s merchant shipping without first defeating its fleet. But in practice, the diesel submarine favored those powers whose economies were least dependent on the sea for obtaining raw materials, regardless of whether a state was the dominant or weaker naval power. Thus, the diesel submarine favored Germany over Great Britain but also favored the United States over Japan.

Second, the effects of technology in a conflict between non-peer competitors can be misleading. During the Vietnam War, the U.S. Navy and Air Force fought an intense air war with Soviet-equipped North Vietnamese air defense forces. This experience came to define both services’ doctrines for dealing with modern Soviet air defenses during the late Cold War even though these were qualitatively and quantitatively much superior to those of North Vietnam. Presumptions that the air defense problem was in hand in turn led to assumptions that air power could accomplish missions, such as Battlefield Air Interdiction (BAI), that it almost certainly could not. Aspects of this problem are clearly in play today, particularly with regard to the problem of finding and attacking mobile missiles ashore. UAVs are often cited as the solution to this problem based on their success in more than a decade of operations as part of the War on Terror, yet this fighting occurs in a completely benign air defense.

Third, many argue that American aircraft carriers are threatened with obsolescence because their air wings are out-ranged by land-based forces such as the Chinese ASBM. It has actually been the norm for land-based aviation to out-range carrier aviation since the dawn of aviation. U.S. carrier aviation was certainly out-ranged by Japanese land-based naval aviation in the Pacific during WWII, as it was by Soviet land-based naval aviation during the Cold War. Instead, variations in the vulnerability of aircraft carriers to land-based aviation have depended more on the quality of an opponent’s ocean surveillance capabilities, and of the carrier’s fleet air defenses.

Fourth, the U.S. ASW posture experienced a serious scare in the last decade of the Cold War with the deployment of the first truly quiet Soviet nuclear submarines. Unlike some other warfare areas where R&D and modernization dried up with the end of the Cold War, the U.S. Navy, and particularly its submarine force, did not abandon a broad effort to repair its long held advantages in both quieting and passive acoustic sensing. This effort has born fruit, one example being the stupendous performance that modern, thin line (i.e. long), towed arrays have demonstrated operationally against even the quietest Chinese submarines. It would be a mistake to assume that major elements of the U.S. Navy’s Cold War ASW barrier strategy will not be transferable to the Western Pacific, and some of that transfer has already begun.

Finally, much is made of the concept of asymmetry in today’s debates about China’s rise as an air and naval power. Symmetry is not a new concept and it is important to be clear as to its significance. The diesel submarine was an asymmetric weapon in that it cost much less to produce a submarine threat than it did to counter it. But taking the two powers most threatened by diesel submarines in World War II—Britain and Japan—Britain could pay the price of countering submarines, while Japan could not—and suffered accordingly. Being on the expensive end of an asymmetric competition is not in and of itself the problem, especially when the value of winning the competition is also great.
Training
Future Leaders

Training the next generation of security studies scholars and practitioners is a principal focus of the MIT Security Studies Program (SSP) and a major component of the Department of Political Science. There were 30 doctoral students and a few master’s candidates enrolled in the program last year, studying such varied topics as ethnic conflict, civil-military relations, and nuclear proliferation. The student experience is further enriched by our efforts to continue the education of senior members of the U.S. military: Five military fellows served with SSP this past year. SSP enrolls a large number of students with diverse interests, maintains an active alumni network via our Alumni Initiative, and offers over 26 courses addressing a wide array of security-related matters, in order to produce individuals adept at analyzing the issues that surround international and civil conflict. Because the use of force is a costly and risky business, society needs an academic and policy-making community equipped to assess the multiple causes and implications of armed conflict.
Courses

17.40 American Foreign Policy: Past, Present, and Future
Subject’s mission is to explain and evaluate America’s past and present foreign policies. What accounts for America’s past wars and interventions? What were the consequences of American policies? Overall, were these consequences positive or negative for the United States? For the world? Using today’s 20/20 hindsight, can we now identify policies that would have produced better results? History covered includes World Wars I and II, the Korean and Indochina wars, and the Cuban Missile Crisis. Recent and contemporary crises and issues are also covered.
S. Van Evera

17.408 Chinese Foreign Policy
Examines the sources of China’s foreign and security policy, past and present. Seminar places particular emphasis on the role of strategy and warfare in China’s interactions with other states. Readings include primary sources such as Sun Zi’s Art of War, as well as key secondary works on China’s diplomatic and military history covering the periods before and after 1949. Graduate students are expected to explore material in greater depth. Exposure to international relations of Chinese politics required.
T. Fravel

17.418 Field Seminar in International Relations Theory
Provides an overview of the field of international relations for graduate students. Each week, a different approach to explaining international relations is examined. Surveys major concepts and theories in the field and assists in the preparation for further study in the department’s more specialized graduate offerings in international relations.
T. Fravel, V. Narang

17.42 Causes and Prevention of War
Examines the causes of war, with a focus on practical measures to prevent and control war. Topics covered include: causes and consequences of national misperception; military strategy and policy as cause of war; U.S. foreign policy as a cause of war and peace; and the likelihood and possible nature of another world war. Historical cases are examined, including World War I, World War II, Korea, and Indochina.
S. Van Evera

17.428 American Foreign Policy: Theory and Method
Examines the causes and consequences of American foreign policy since 1898. Readings cover theories of American foreign policy, historiography of American foreign policy, central historical episodes including the two World Wars and the Cold War, case study methodology, and historical investigative methods.
S. Van Evera

17.432 Causes of War: Theory and Method
Examines the causes of war. Major theories of war are examined; case-study and large-n methods of testing theories of war are discussed; and the case study method is applied to several historical cases. Cases covered include World Wars I and II.
S. Van Evera

17.433 International Relations of East Asia
Examines the sources of conflict and cooperation in the international relations of East Asia since 1945. Topics covered include the origins of the Cold War in the region, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the China-Soviet split, the strategic triangle, the sources of regional order, and China’s rise in the 1990s. Contemporary issues—including U.S.-China relations, the Taiwan conflict, North Korea’s nuclear weapons program, and terrorism—will also be explored. Graduate students are expected to complete additional assignments.
T. Fravel

17.436 Territorial Conflict
While scholars have recognized that territory has been one of the most frequent issues over which states go to war, territorial conflicts have only recently become the subject of systematic study. This course will examine why territorial conflicts arise in the first place, why some of these conflicts escalate to high levels of violence, and why other territorial disputes reach settlement, thereby reducing a likely source of violence between states. Readings in the course draw upon political geography and history as well as qualitative and quantitative approaches to political science.
T. Fravel
17.468 Foundations of Security Studies
Aims to develop a working knowledge of the theories and conceptual frameworks that form the intellectual basis of security studies as an academic discipline. Particular emphasis is on balance of power theory, organization theory, civil-military relations, and the relationship between war and politics. The reading list includes Jervis, Schelling, Waltz, Blainey, von Clausewitz, and Huntington. Students write a seminar paper in which theoretical insights are systematically applied to a current security issue.
B. Posen

17.473 The Politics of Nuclear Proliferation
Provides an introduction to the politics and theories surrounding the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Introduces the basics of nuclear weapons, nuclear strategy, and deterrence theory. Examines the historical record during the Cold War as well as the proliferation of nuclear weapons to regional powers and the resulting deterrence consequences.
V. Narang

17.478 Great Power Military Intervention: Causes, Conduct, and Consequences of Military Intervention in Internal Conflicts—Cases from the Post-Cold War World
The purpose of this seminar is to examine systematically, and comparatively, great and middle power military interventions into civil wars during the 1990s. The interventions to be examined are the 1991 effort to protect the Kurds in N. Iraq; the 1993 effort to ameliorate famine in Somalia; the 1994 effort to restore the Aristide government in Haiti, the 1995 effort to end the conflict in Bosnia Herzegovina, and the 1999 NATO war to end Serbia’s control of Kosovo. By way of comparison, the weak efforts made to slow or stop the 1994 genocide in Rwanda will also be examined.
B. Posen, R. Petersen

17.482 U.S. Military Power
Examines the evolving roles and missions of U.S. General Purpose Forces within the context of modern technological capabilities and Grand Strategy, which is a conceptual system of interconnected political and military means and ends. Topics include U.S. Grand Strategies; the organization of the U.S. military; the defense budget; and the capabilities and limitations of naval, air, and ground forces. Also examines the utility of these forces for power projections and the problems of escalation. Analyzes military history and simple models of warfare to explore how variations in technology and battlefield conditions can drastically alter the effectiveness of conventional forces.
B. Posen

17.484 Comparative Grand Strategy and Military Doctrine
A comparative study of the grand strategies and military doctrines of the great powers in Europe [Britain, France, Germany, and Russia] from the late-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. Examines strategic developments in the years preceding and during World Wars I and II. What factors have exerted the greatest influence on national strategies? How may the quality of a Grand Strategy be judged? Exploration of comparative case study methodology also plays a central role. What consequences seem to follow from grand strategies of different types?
B. Posen

17.486 Japan and East Asian Security
Explores Japan’s role in world orders, past, present, and future. Focuses on Japanese conceptions of security; rearmament debates; the relationship of domestic politics to foreign policy; the impact of Japanese technological and economic transformation at home and abroad; alternative trade and security regimes; and relations with Asian neighbors, Russia, and the alliance with the United States. Seminar culminates in a two-day Japanese-centered crisis simulation, based upon scenarios developed by students.
R.J. Samuels

17.53 The Rise of Asia
Focuses on social, economic, political, and national security problems of Japan, China, and India -- three rising powers in a dynamic region with the potential to shape global affairs. Examines each topic and country from the perspectives of history, contemporary issues, and their relations with one another and the United States.
R. Samuels, M. T. Fravel, V. Narang
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.537</td>
<td>Politics and Policy in Contemporary Japan</td>
<td>Analyzes contemporary Japanese politics, focusing primarily upon the post-World War II period. Includes examination of the dominant approaches to Japanese politics and society, the structure of the party system, the role of political opposition, the policy process, foreign affairs, and interest groups. Attention to defense, foreign, industrial, social, energy, and technology policy processes. Graduate students are expected to pursue the subject in greater depth through reading and class presentations. Assignments differ.</td>
<td>R.J. Samuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.568</td>
<td>Comparative Politics and International Relations of the Middle East</td>
<td>Surveys both classic and cutting-edge work on the politics of the Middle East, broadly defined. Topics include the causes and consequences of political and economic development, authoritarianism and democratization, the influence of social movements, the role of women in Middle Eastern polities, regional inter-state relations, Islamism, terrorism, colonialism and foreign occupation, state-building, resistance and rebellion, and the Arab uprisings.</td>
<td>R. Nielsen, F. Christia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.569</td>
<td>Russia’s Foreign Policy: Toward the Post-Soviet States and Beyond</td>
<td>Analyzes Russia’s foreign policy, with a focus on relations with the other post-Soviet states. Frames the discussion with examination of U.S.-Russian and Sino-Russian relations. Looks at legacies of the Soviet collapse, strengths and vulnerabilities of Russia, and the ability of other states to maintain their sovereignty. Topics include the future of Central Asia, the Georgian war, energy politics, and reaction to the European Union’s Eastern Partnership. Readings focus on international relations, historical sources, and contemporary Russian and Western sources.</td>
<td>R. Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.581</td>
<td>Riots, Rebellions, Revolutions</td>
<td>Examines different types of violent political conflict. Compares and contrasts several social science approaches (psychological, sociological, and political) and analyzes their ability to explain variation in outbreak, duration and outcome of conflict. Examines incidents such as riots in the U.S. during the 1960’s, riots in India, the Yugoslav wars, and the Russian Revolution, in addition to current international events.</td>
<td>R. Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.582</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>Surveys the social science literature on civil war. Studies the origins of civil war, discusses variables affecting duration, and examines termination of conflict. Highly interdisciplinary and covers a wide variety of cases. Open to advanced undergraduates with permission of instructor.</td>
<td>F. Christia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.583</td>
<td>Conflict and the Graphic Novel</td>
<td>Presents the roots and consequences of violent conflict through the graphic novel. Proceeds thematically and addresses an array of violent dynamics and processes such as revolution, occupation, insurgency, ethnic conflict, terrorism and genocide through graphic novels. Covers some of the most important cases of violent unrest over the last seventy years such as the Holocaust, the war in Vietnam, the 1979 Iranian Revolution, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia, and the recent Iraq war.</td>
<td>F. Christia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.584</td>
<td>Civil-Military Relations</td>
<td>Subject consists of five sections. After a general survey of the field, students consider cases of stable civilian control, military rule, and transitions from military to civilian rule. Cases are selected from around the world.</td>
<td>R. Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.586</td>
<td>Warlords, Terrorists, and Militias: Theorizing on Violent Non-State Actors</td>
<td>Examines why non-state actors resort to violence, their means and tactics, and what can be done to counter that violence. Focuses on the production side of non-state violence, including the objectives and organization of insurgents, terrorists, militias and warlords, their mobilization strategies and support base, and how they coerce opponents. Also covers the response violence elicits from governments or other actors such as counterinsurgency or counterterrorism strategies.</td>
<td>F. Christia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.950 Understanding Military Operations
This seminar will break apart current and possible future sea, air, space, and land battlefields into their constituent parts, and look at the interaction in each of those warfare areas between existing military doctrine and current and projected technological trends in weapons, sensors, communications, and information processing. It will specifically seek to explore how technological development, innovation, and/or stagnation are influenced in each warfare area by military doctrine.
O. Cote

17.956 Insurgency
This seminar offers a general overview of the political science literature on insurgency and counterinsurgency. It aims to address questions of definition, operationalization of variables, and general methodological issues relevant to conducting research on insurgency and counterinsurgency. In that regard, the course looks at issues pertaining to the role of ethnicity, violence, poverty, aid and technology at how insurgencies are started, get fought and are countered or prevail. The course introduces the basic variables as well as the theoretical and empirical findings in the literature and discusses cases of insurgency and counterinsurgency in a variety of regions.
V. Narang and F. Gavin

17.S950 Nuclear Proliferation Strategy
How should we best understand the profound influence nuclear weapons have had on international relations? The nuclear question has been a central concern of security studies since the United States dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima in August 1945. Yet on many subjects central to nuclear weapons—deterrence, coercion, strategy, proliferation and non-proliferation—there is both sharp historical and theoretical debate and disagreement. There is also an important discussion over the best scholarly methods to get at these issues. This advanced graduate seminar explores the cutting edge of academic research in a variety of areas related to nuclear weapons.
V. Narang and F. Gavin

17.S951 The Cold War Revisited
The Cold War was the defining experience of international politics in the second half of the 20th century. Building upon new trends in international history and the release of once secret documents in capitals around the world, scholars are reassessing every aspect of the Cold War – including its origins, consequences, and ending. What was once seen as a simplistic, bipolar struggle between geopolitical and ideological foes that lasted almost half a century, is now seen as a far more complex, complicated history with many twists and new emphasis on other actors. This seminar will sample some of the best new historical works on the Cold War, with a particular eye towards how these new understandings of the past influence our stock of international relations theory.
F. Gavin

17.S953 History, Strategy and Statecraft: Historical Methods for International Relations
What is history? This course will examine the different ways scholarly history is practiced, with a focus on the history of foreign policy and international relations. We will also explore the question: can a familiarity with historical analysis and methods improve our understanding of world politics, strategy, and statecraft?
F. Gavin
Colloquia for Academic Year 2014-15

**First Colloquium**

Lena Andrews “Evaluating the Purple Force: Air Land Coordination and the Effectiveness of Joint Operations” - Posen

Fiona Cunningham “Seizing the Initiative? China’s Force Postures in the Nuclear, Space and Cyber Domains” - Fravel

Marika Landau-Wells “From Scary Ideas to Scary Identities: Developing and Testing a Theory of Political Threat Perception” - Petersen and Christia

Ketian Zhang “Smart Bully: Understanding China’s Non-Military Coercion” - Fravel

**Second Colloquium**

Mark Bell “Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy” - Posen

Christopher Clary “The Politics of Peace: The End of Interstate Rivalries” - Samuels

Kelly Grieco “War by Coalition: The Effects of Coalition Military Institutionalization on Coalition Military Effectiveness” - Posen

**Dissertations Completed: 2014-15**

Several students were on the September 2014 Degree List. They would have defended in the summer of 2014:

Brian Haggerty (SM) “Safe Havens in Syria: Missions and Requirements for an Air Campaign” – Van Evera

Keng Meng Tan (SM) “Getting to the Table: Explaining the Incidence of Mediation in the Insurgencies of Indonesia” - Petersen

Nicholas Miller “Hegemony and Nuclear Proliferation” - Fravel

Sameer Lalwani “Selective Leviathans: Explaining State Strategies of Counterinsurgency and Consolidation” - Petersen

February 2015 Degree List:

Miranda Priebe “Still Strong: The Problems of Deterrence and Reassurance from Dominance” - Posen

June 2015 Degree List:

Dan Altman “Red Lines and Faits Accomplis in Interstate Coercion and Crisis” - Posen
Graduate Students and their Research

PhD

Noel Thomas Anderson – Competitive Intervention and its Consequences for Civil Wars

Lena Simone Andrew – Evaluating the “Purple” Force: Air-Land Coordination and the Effectiveness of Joint Operations

Mark Bell – Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy

Christopher Oren Clary – The Politics of Peace: The End of Interstate Rivalries

Fiona Stephanie Cunningham – Seizing the Initiative? China’s Force Posture in the Nuclear, Space and Cyber Domains

Benjamin Friedman – Threat Perception in U.S. Foreign Policy

Kelly Grieco – War by Coalition: The Effects of Coalition Military Institutionalization on Coalition Military Effectiveness

Stephanie Kaplan – The Jihad Effect: How Wars Feed the Global Jihadist Movement

Marika Landau-Wells – From Scary Ideas to Scary Identities: Developing and Testing a Theory of Political Threat Perception

Phil Martin – Civil wars, political order and rebellion in weak and failed states, post-conflict governance, humanitarian intervention

Tim McDonnell – Nuclear Policy and the U.S. Nuclear Arsenal, 1946-Present: A Case of Accidental Dominance?

Andrew Miller – Technology and intrastate conflict

Kacie Miura – Chinese foreign policy, international institutions, China-Africa relations

Rachel Odell – Chinese foreign policy, U.S. strategy toward Asia, Sino-Japanese relations, civil-military relations, international maritime law, the role of the media in foreign policy signaling

Reid Pauly – Deterrence reestablishment, nuclear strategy, nuclear proliferation, Arctic security

Amanda Rothschild – The Determinants of U.S. Policy in Response to Genocide and Mass Atrocity

Joseph Peter Torigian – How Militaries in Revolutionary Societies Affect Political Trajectories

Alec Worsnop – Organization and Community: Determinants of Insurgent Military Effectiveness

Ketian Zhang – Smart Bully: Explaining Chinese Coercion. That is, when, why, and how does Chinese use coercion for national security issues
Graduate Student Publications

Noel Anderson

Mark Bell

Christopher Clary

The Drivers of Long-Term Insecurity and Instability in Pakistan with Jonah Blank and Brian Nichiporuk, SSP alum [RAND Corporation: 2014].

Benjamin Friedman

Philip Martin

Nicholas Miller


Amanda Rothschild


Alec Worsnop
“A Closer Look at ISIS in Iraq,” *Political Violence @ a Glance* blog, June 20, 2014.

Graduate Student Fellowships and Awards

Noel Anderson
Awarded a National Fellowship from the Miller Center and a Jennings Randolph Peace Scholarship from the United States Institute of Peace for the 2015-16 academic year.

Awarded a Dissertation Fellowship from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation. These very competitive fellowships support dissertation write-up and are aimed at “research that can increase understanding and amelioration of urgent problems of violence and aggression in the modern world.”

Marika Landau-Wells
Awarded a Tobin Project Graduate Student Fellowship for the 2015-2016 academic year.

Rachel Odell
Won an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship.

Amanda Rothschild
Received the Harry Middleton Fellowship in Presidential Studies. The fellowship, created by Lady Bird Johnson to support scholarship in presidential studies and the honor Harry Middleton, is awarded to up to two scholars annually whose research highlights how history can inform current and future policy issues.

Accepted a predoctoral fellowship in the International Security Program with the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University.

Steve Wittels
Awarded a Tobin Project Graduate Student Fellowship for the 2015-2016 academic year.

Alec Worsnop
Awarded a Predoctoral Research Fellowship at the Institute for Security and Conflict Studies in the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University. He was also selected to present at the New Faces Conference hosted by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies.

Awarded a Dissertation Fellowship from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation. These very competitive fellowships support dissertation write-up and are aimed at “research that can increase understanding and amelioration of urgent problems of violence and aggression in the modern world.”
On March 21st, 2015, SSP graduate students, fellows, and faculty headed across the pond for the annual spring break trip. In addition to two RAF base visits in the UK and a trip to the American Embassy in London, the group spent two days in Normandy and capped off the trip with a visit to the Imperial War Museum. The group was led by Prof. Taylor Fravel and included Joli Divon Saraf, SSP Assistant Director, the SSP military fellows – COL John Henderson (USA), COL Glenn Voltz (USA), LtCol Stephane Wolfgeher (USAF), LtCol Eric Thompson (USMC) and CDR Ryan Bernacchi (USN) – as well as two Stanton Nuclear fellows and twelve PhD students.

The themes of this year’s trip were cooperation and history. From current NATO intelligence fusion to State Department/Department of Defense coordination at the U.S. Embassy in London, to the staff ride in Normandy, the group learned to appreciate the significance of inter-agency, inter-service, and international cooperation in past and present conflicts. In preparation for the trip to Normandy, the group watched The Longest Day, an Academy Award-winning re-enactment of D-Day, and brushed up on their World War II history prior to departure.

After a short red-eye flight from Boston, the group touched down at London’s Heathrow Airport. A convoy formed at the rental car agency to transport the group to the other Cambridge, approximately 1.5 hours northeast. The convoy fell apart in record time – technically prior to leaving Heathrow – as a certain Army intelligence officer was led astray by his onboard navigation system.

Upon arrival in the other Cambridge, post-red eye fatigue set in for some. Mitigation strategies varied. Pints, punting, and exercise all met with some level of success. However, at least one group member fell asleep at the dinner table.

The next morning, the group traveled to RAF Molesworth, a Royal Air Force base located northeast of Cambridge. On base, the group visited the NATO Intelligence Fusion Centre (NIFC), one of the main conduits for integrating strategic and operational intelligence from NATO members and partners. The NIFC is a truly cooperative organization, with twenty-six of the twenty-eight NATO members represented and other close partners, such as Sweden and Australia, posting analysts there. With over thirty-six languages spoken by NIFC’s analysts, the briefers stressed the value of the centre’s human capital. Moreover, they made clear that the NIFC fused and integrated intelligence to the greatest extent possible in order to produce “NATO products,” rather than American or German ones.

While at Molesworth, the group also received a briefing from an intelligence officer with U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM), whose core mission is to “build defense capabilities, respond to crises, and deter and defeat transitional threats.” In pursuing this mission, the briefer highlighted the range of conflicts that the command attempts to mitigate, from pursuing leaders of the Lord’s Resistance Army in Uganda to combatting piracy in the Gulf of Guinea.

Following lunch, the group headed to RAF Lakenheath. At Lakenheath, LTC Philip D. Principi first briefed the group on the 48th Operations Group, the nation’s premier combat wing. LTC Principi detailed the F-15E, F-15C, HH-60 aircraft, and support missions related to the 48th Operations Group. He further explained that the 48th Operations Group’s mission entails that they strive for air superiority, accurate and timely bombing, and the successful rescue of downed aircraft. Recently, the group has been involved in several critical U.S. operations, including leading initial U.S. attacks against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) earlier this year. Other recent missions include Operation Enduring Freedom and Blue Flag.

Following the briefing, the group had the opportunity to test their flight skills in an F-15C flight simulator. Each person spent about fifteen minutes in the simulator, conducting a successful takeoff, engaging in combat with two other group members, and finally landing the jet. Levels of success (and survival) varied, but everyone had fun testing their skills. The results of the head-to-head between the two fighter pilot fellows (Navy vs. Air Force) remain a closely guarded secret to this day.
Convoying skills were again put to the test on the wrong side of the road as the group transited from Cambridgeshire to London. Arriving – not together, but all in one piece – the group happily ditched the vehicles and headed to nearest pub.

An early start the next morning saw the group arrive at the U.S. Embassy in Grosvenor Square, London U.S. where they were briefed by Embassy officials LtCol Tiley Nunnink (USMC), Alexander Guittard, and Tom Tate. LtCol Nunnink explained his primary responsibilities as a military attaché at the Embassy: advising the U.S. ambassador, representing the U.S. and the military and coordinating civil-military affairs, and monitoring and reporting on political events in the UK. Foreign Service Officer Alexander Guittard detailed his own career path following his graduation from Boston College in 2011. He explained the process of becoming a Foreign Service Officer and his duties since joining the Embassy. Finally, Tom Tate gave a nuanced presentation on the Office of Defense Cooperation, which includes DOD Acquisition Policy, Defense Cooperation in Armaments, Security Assistance, Logistics Plans, and Industrial Cooperation. Mr. Tate explained that his role is to coordinate between several government officials and private institutions, including the U.S. Ambassador in London, the UK Ministry of Defense, the U.S. military, the U.S. and UK defense industries, the Secretary of Defense, and the U.S. EUCOM Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Q&A session focused on how Embassy officials interacted with representatives from countries not aligned with the United States, on the main policy issues affecting the UK-U.S. relationship today, and on how the Embassy balances a heightened need for security with an equally pressing need for diplomatic engagement. All left the Embassy impressed by the levels of coordination and civilian-military engagement necessary for Embassy operations.

At 9 AM, the group departed their base in Bayeux for a staff ride led by Eddie – a colorful and remarkably well-read historian of the WWII campaigns in Normandy. En route to the town of Carentan, Eddie delivered a fast-paced, non-stop stream of historical knowledge and technical insights. His lecture covered Allied bombing strategy, the surprisingly low level of mechanization of the German army, and the strategic significance of the lock-gate flooding system in Normandy for the Allied invasion. This firehose of historical information flowed non-stop for the duration of the tour.

The bus stopped briefly at Drop Zone "W", where Allied airborne paratroopers landed on the night of the D-Day invasion. Eddie explained the tactics of the Allied airborne invasion and the various German fortifications and defenses they faced on the ground.

At the town of Ste.-Mère-Eglise, the group toured the U.S. Airborne Museum. The museum focuses on the tactics, equipment, and personal experiences of the U.S. airborne paratroopers in Normandy during World War II. There were also exhibits detailing the battles around Ste.-Mère-Eglise and post-war relations among the Allied nations. A highlight of the museum was the exhibit of Operation Neptune, which included a detailed replica of the interior of a C-47 paratrooper transport airplane on the night of June 5, 1944, meant to simulate the experience of a nighttime air drop. The group also saw displays on the humanitarian consequences of the invasion – over 20,000 civilians in Normandy were killed by Allied bombings and artillery during the campaign – and an example of the WACO ("Hadrian") glider used to transport troops and equipment over the English Channel.
Opposite the museum, the group saw the church for which the town was named, with a life-sized paratrooper mannequin dangling from the bell tower in homage to a scene from The Longest Day. Eddie pointed out to the group that Hollywood’s re-enactment of the paratrooper’s fate was likely incorrect. However, the more photogenic and dramatic version of “history” seemed to have won out in Ste.-Mère-Eglise.

Following this reminder not to believe everything they saw in movies, the group departed for Utah Beach. There, they caught sight of their first German bunkers buried in the large sand dunes along with mortar pits and “resistance nests.” After lunch at a restaurant also conspicuously (and somewhat creepily) decorated with World War II mannequins, the group hit Utah Beach, the western-most beach in Operation Overlord. Eddie pointed out that the tide was out, exposing 400 yards of open sand – the same conditions the 4th Division would have encountered during their landing on the morning of June 6th, 1944. While the group found today’s beach welcoming and serene, Eddie showed where the beach obstacles and bunkers had long ago been cleared, sunk into the sand, or been covered over by dunes. He also highlighted the numerous differences between the real obstacles faced by the troops landing on the beach and those contained in cinematic accounts, such as Saving Private Ryan.

The group also learned that the history of the beach landings in the Utah sector had been largely overshadowed by the stories of the paratroopers of the 101st and 82nd Airborne who landed behind the beach to secure the inland access roads. A major lesson of the afternoon was about how influential terrain can be on the prosecution of warfare. Behind the beach, the group saw several examples of the infamous Normandy hedgerows, which cleave the landscape in every direction for sixty-five miles beyond the beaches. Eddie explained that hedgerows offered a distinct defensive advantage, providing cover for men, tanks, and guns. Moreover, when coupled with Normandy’s distinctively flat landscape, hedgerows impaired visual reconnaissance in all directions.

The next stop on the staff ride was Pointe du Hoc, site of a daring commando raid conducted by the 2nd Ranger Battalion. The Rangers’ mission was to scale the cliffs and knock out a battery of 155mm guns, which would have been well positioned to fire upon both Utah and Omaha beaches or to sink incoming Allied ships. But, as Eddie explained, the Rangers who took the site on D-Day found that the guns were missing and had been hidden in an orchard nearby.

Scrambling around [and into] the remnants of the fortifications at Pointe du Hoc, the group saw up close the ineffectiveness of Allied air bombardment and naval shelling. While the USS Texas alone fired more than 600 rounds at Pointe du Hoc’s fortifications, less than five percent of the German bunkers had actually been destroyed by naval and aerial bombardment before the Rangers arrived. At the site, it was clear that even near-misses by thousand-pound gravity bombs had resulted in negligible damage to the six foot-thick, concrete-fortified German positions. Indeed, the cratered grounds of Pointe du Hoc belied the intact and intricate system of bunkers and tunnels just feet below the surface. Eddie took the group underground to show how a Ranger team with strategically placed demolition charges had done more damage than the massive bombardments.

The next day’s activities centered on a visit to Omaha Beach and the nearby Normandy American Cemetery and memorial. At Omaha Beach, the group was able to see first-hand the formidable and well-concealed defensive positions which American forces encountered on D-Day. Standing on the beach itself, it became clear how a small garrison of fewer than four hundred German troops was able to inflict such horrific casualty rates on American forces. According to Eddie, some units landing on D-Day lost as many as ninety-five percent of their soldiers.
Omaha Beach also afforded the group the opportunity to see how a combination of terrain, concentration of force, and chance influenced the battle. Unlike Utah Beach, which was comparatively flat, Omaha Beach sits below imposing bluffs 80 to 150 feet high, situated some three hundred yards from the water-line. Eddie explained that the Americans had intended to land as close as possible to the small number of gaps in the bluffs (“beach exits”), through which it would be comparatively easy to stream troops and supplies. However, these beach exits were heavily defended by the Germans, whereas long stretches of the coastal bluffs were not. Thus, when the vagaries of ocean currents and tides pulled landing craft away from their targeted positions, the Americans were able to land relatively unopposed. These soldiers could climb the bluffs, circle around, and attack the German defenses from the rear. While casualties among allied units attacking beach exits exceeded seventy-five percent, casualty rates for units that attacked over the bluffs were much lower.

Following the staff ride, the group traveled to the Normandy American Cemetery and Memorial where 9,387 white tombstones mark the graves of Americans killed in Normandy during World War II. The names of 1,557 soldiers who were killed but never found also line a memorial wall. This portion of the trip was a sobering reminder of the costs of war.

Upon their return to Bayeux, many in the group paid a visit to the Bayeux Tapestry Museum. While the Bayeux Tapestry depicted an event of the far distant past – William the Conqueror’s invasion of Britain in 1066 – the group had a greater appreciation for the task, having become well-versed in the difficult logistics of large-scale invasions. The next day, the group made its way back to London before a final dinner at the aptly named Anglo-French Café Rouge.

Before flying back to Boston, the group headed to the Imperial War Museum for one last dose of history. The World War II exhibit contained footage and first-hand accounts of the Normandy invasion, which were especially poignant given the staff ride. There was also a wealth of information and illustrative armaments from a number of the other conflicts that form the basis of the Security Studies Program’s scholarship. All in all, the group left Europe with a greater appreciation of the difficulties of war-fighting – both in terms of the challenges faced in the great campaigns of World War II and in terms of the complex, modern conflicts in which we are engaged today.
Fellow for the 30th Chief of Naval Operations Strategic Studies Group tasked with the development of advanced operational concepts for the Navy at the Naval War College in Newport, RI. He earned a Masters Degree in National Security and Strategic Studies at the War College.


Commander Bernacchi’s next assignment is as the commanding officer of the U.S. Navy flight demonstration squadron, the Blue Angels for the 2016-17 seasons.

**Colonel John Henderson, United States Army**

Colonel Henderson is a native of South Dakota and a graduate of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology with a master’s degree in Civil Engineering. Colonel Henderson most recently served as the Executive Officer to the Commanding General for the U. S. Army’s 1st Corps (America’s Corps) located at Joint Base Lewis McChord, WA.

Previously, Colonel Henderson commanded the 864th Engineer Battalion (Task Force Pacemaker) as the unit deployed to eastern Afghanistan to conduct engineering operations in support of the U. S. Central Command (CENTCOM) Materiel Recovery Element (CMRE) with mission command responsibilities for 960 Soldiers and Airmen from the Active, Reserve, and National Guard components.

In his next assignment Colonel Henderson will serve as the commander for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District at Omaha, NE. The change of command ceremony is current scheduled for July 31, 2015.

The Omaha District commander oversees an annual program which exceeds $1 billion spread over 1,200 military construction projects in eight states, civil works projects in nine states, and environmental restoration projects in 41 states. The Omaha District workforce of about 1,300 civilian men and women contribute to the operation of six main-stem dams and their associated hydro-power plants on the Missouri River, as well as 21 tributary dams for congressionally-authorized purposes. The district also provides regulatory and real estate services that benefit the Nation. Within the 700,000-square-mile boundary of the Omaha District, the District Commander also oversees the design and construction of facilities for 26 Army and Air Force installations, the cleanup of hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste sites for the Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency.

**Lieutenant Colonel Eric Thompson, United States Marine Corps**

Lieutenant Colonel Thompson was commissioned in June 1996 and upon completion of The Basic School and Infantry Officers Course, he was assigned to the 1st Marine Division where he served as a platoon commander and company executive officer in 2d Battalion, 4th Marines. While with 2/4 and the 31st MEU, Lieutenant Thompson took part in Operation Sudden Storm/Desert Fox.

He served as a platoon commander in 1st Force Reconnaissance Company, and as Officer In Charge of the Basic Reconnaissance Course, Expeditionary Warfare Training Group, Pacific.

In February 2003, he joined Marine Special Operations Command Detachment One (Det 1) to serve as the reconnaissance & assault platoon commander for the Marine Corps’ first unit contribution to United States Special Operations Command. Following a three year tour at USNORTHCOM, Lieutenant Colonel Thompson assumed command of 3d Reconnaissance Battalion, 3d Marine Division, in Okinawa, Japan. He served as Commanding Officer for two years (July 2012-June 2014). During this period elements of 3d Recon Battalion supported dozens of Theater Security Cooperation exercises and multiple 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit deployments.

In his next assignment, Lieutenant Colonel Thompson is going to the U.S. Department of State in Washington D.C. to work Counter-Terrorism. This will involve coordinating training exercises and plans with Embassies and U.S. Military counter-terrorism units.

**Lieutenant Colonel Glenn Voelz, United States Army**

Lieutenant Colonel Voelz was commissioned as an Infantry officer from the United States Military Academy at West Point, and his early assignments included service as a platoon leader with two separate infantry battalions in Berlin, Germany and
Vicenza, Italy. In 1994 he was selected for the Army’s World Class Athlete Program in the sport of Modern Pentathlon, was a member of the U.S. National Team and finished seventh at the 1996 U.S. Olympic Trials.

From 2001-2004 he was an Assistant Professor of History at West Point and received the faculty’s Excellence in Teaching Award.

He served as the senior intelligence advisor with the U.S. Military Training Mission in Riyadh; was assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff as an Intelligence planning officer; then subsequently as the Executive Assistant to the Joint Staff Director for Intelligence (J2); the Deputy Director for Intelligence at the Combined Media Processing Center in Doha; and then returned to Washington as Assistant Deputy Director for Intelligence in the National Military Command Center at the Pentagon. From 2009-2011 he was assigned to the National Security Staff. Since 2011 he has worked in the Intelligence Directorate of U.S. Army Africa, supervising a division responsible for Intelligence planning, strategy, security assistance, exercises and training activities with African partner nations.

Lieutenant Colonel Voelz is the author of several recent monographs and professional journal articles in the areas of government acquisition, diplomatic history, and intelligence policy, including Contractors in the Government Workplace (Government Institutes Press, 2009), Images of Enemy and Self in the Age of Jefferson, the Barbary Conflict in Popular Literary Depiction (War and Society Journal, 2009), and Managing the Private Spies: The Use of Commercial Augmentation for Intelligence Operations (Center for Strategic Intelligence Research, 2006). He holds a Bachelor of Science degree from West Point, a Masters of Arts from the University of Virginia, and a Masters of Science in Strategic Intelligence from the National Intelligence University in Washington, D.C.

After leaving MIT, Colonel Voelz will be the senior analyst and production chief in the Intelligence Division of the International Military Staff (IMS) at NATO Headquarters in Brussels, Belgium. He will manage a team providing strategic warning and situational awareness to NATO HQ elements and supervise production of NATO-agreed intelligence assessments.

**Lieutenant Colonel Stephane L. Wolfgeher, United States Air Force**

Prior to the start of her Senior Developmental Education Fellowship at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Lieutenant Colonel Stephane L. Wolfgeher commanded the 309th Fighter Squadron at Luke AFB, Arizona. The mission of the 309th Fighter Squadron is to produce the world’s greatest F-16 fighter pilots ready to meet the requirements of the combat air forces and deploy mission-ready warfighters. Her experience spans operations at the theater, major command, and unit levels. She is a senior pilot with more than 2,500 flying hours, and 220 combat hours.

Lieutenant Colonel Wolfgeher was commissioned in May 1995. She has served as both an F-15E ‘Strike Eagle’ Weapon Systems Officer and F-16 ‘Viper’ Pilot in a variety of positions, including scheduling officer, standardization and evaluation liaison officer, plans and mobility chief, training chief, operational instructor and evaluator, major command evaluator, executive officer, replacement training unit instructor, operations support squadron director of operations and squadron commander. Her assignments include an F-15E WSO tour at Seymour Johnson AFB and F-16 assignments at Hill AFB, Utah; Kunsan Air Base, South Korea; and attached to Aviano AB, Italy, during her staff tour as USAFE/A3 standardization and evaluation F-16CG chief pilot.

Lieutenant Colonel Wolfgeher has deployed in support of operations Northern Watch, Iraqi Freedom, and Enduring Freedom. She holds MS in Information Operations from the Naval Postgraduate School, a Master of Aeronautical Science, from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, and a BS in Computer Science from Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

In her next assignment, Lieutenant Colonel Wolfgeher will be moving to the Pentagon in Washington DC. She will be part of the J5, Africa Division (Joint Staff, Strategic Plans and Policy) and will formulate policy proposals/political-military advice for Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), Vice CJCS, Deputy J5 on North and West Africa policy and strategy; interact with senior National Security Council (NSC), Department of State (DoS), Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), other federal agencies and Combatant Commanders (CENTCOMs) to develop policy guidance; establish/sustain relationships with foreign country counterparts/attachés to facilitate USG policy development; and represent the Joint Staff (JS) at senior-level sub-cabinet meetings to develop and deliberate national security/strategy policies.
Henrik Stålhane Hiim is a research fellow at the Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies and is a PhD student at Oslo University. During the academic year 2014-2015, he was a Stanton Nuclear Security Predoctoral Fellow at SSP. In 2013, he was a visiting fellow at Beijing University. Hiim’s research interests are nonproliferation, arms control and Chinese foreign policy. He holds an M.A. in Political Science from the University of Oslo, and has also studied at Renmin University and Huazhong Normal University in China.

While a Stanton fellow, Hiim worked on his dissertation, which he aims to complete by fall 2015. Based on extensive field-work in China, the dissertation examines the evolution of China’s approach to nuclear proliferation, with a special emphasis on policies towards North Korea, Iran, and Pakistan. The thesis develops a theory for analyzing when, why, and how states support nuclear proliferators. It argues that China has been a strategic supplier, selectively using the spread of nuclear and missile technology as a tool of statecraft.

While at MIT, Hiim presented his work at several conferences, including the 2015 Nuclear Studies Research Initiative (NSRI), as well as at the Nordic Association for China Studies. He also took part in the New Era Foreign Policy Conference, organized by the Bridging the Gap network. Hiim is working on several article projects, including one on China’s nuclear cooperation with Pakistan, as well as an article on how China has used nonproliferation policy as a source of leverage in its bilateral relationship with the United States.

As the Stanton postdoctoral fellow, Alexander Lanoszka worked on diverse projects that involve nuclear security, alliance politics, and theories of war. He used his fellowship year to make significant progress on transforming his dissertation into a book length manuscript. Drawing on extensive archival evidence collected from around the world, this project examines why states that enjoy the security guarantees of a nuclear-armed guarantor move towards, and sometimes back away, from nuclear weapons acquisition. He presented parts of this research at the New Faces in International Security Conference at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the APSA Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. A standalone article based on this research is currently under review.

Lanoszka also used his time at MIT to write articles on various aspects of international security. He and his co-author Michael Hunzeker have a forthcoming publication in Security Studies that examines why the Entente rejected German and American peace overtures in late 1916. Lanoszka won the Palliser Prize for his essay contribution to Survival. This article challenges the notion that weak allies free ride on their stronger counterparts. It also demonstrates that NATO allies in Central and Eastern Europe are actively striving to balance against Russia. Finally, he wrote an op-ed for the online edition of World Affairs to critique the view that American pre-positioning of heavy weaponry in Central and Eastern Europe sends a strong signal of commitment to hosting allies.

He has been working on other projects that are at varying stages of development. He has a piece under review with Keren Yarhi-Milo and Zack Cooper on why major powers sometimes substitute arms transfers for alliances in managing their relations with client states. Another co-authored article [with Thomas Scherer] under review examines whether a No First Use doctrine would stabilize crises between strong and weak states. A single-authored article under review investigates the implications of the so-called nuclear revolution for alliance politics. He is currently working on a new project that explores what Russian hybrid warfare in the former Soviet space means for American extended deterrence. Another project with Rex Douglass reassesses the quantitative literature on nuclear proliferation and nuclear coercion.
Next year he will be at Dartmouth College’s J.S. Dickey Center for International Understanding where he will be a U.S. Foreign Policy and International Security Postdoctoral Fellow.

Julia Macdonald is a PhD candidate in political science at the George Washington University (GWU) and held a Stanton nuclear security pre-doctoral fellowship at MIT during the 2014-15 academic year. Julia’s dissertation research lies at the intersection of coercive diplomacy and foreign policy decision making and investigates the importance of leadership beliefs in shaping assessments of threat credibility during international crises. Her broader research interests include nuclear politics, civil-military relations, and U.S. national security policy. She holds an M.A. [Hons] in International Relations from the University of Chicago and a B.A. [Hons] from the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Prior to joining the program at GWU, Julia worked for the New Zealand Ministry of Defense as an international security analyst for several years.

During her Stanton year at MIT, Julia made substantial progress on her dissertation project and presented her work at the Nuclear Studies Research Initiative (NSRI) conferences in Melbourne, Australia, and Airlie, Virginia, as well as at the annual meetings of the International Studies Association and American Political Science Association. Her research appeared in print issues of the Journal of Strategic Studies, Foreign Policy Analysis, and Armed Forces and Society, online with Foreign Affairs, and was accepted for publication in the Journal of Conflict Resolution. In December 2014, Julia represented GWU and SSP at the German Marshall Fund’s Young Strategists Forum in Japan, Tokyo, and she was named a Center for New American Security Next Generation National Security Leader for 2015.

Julia is working as a summer associate at the RAND Corporation in Washington D.C. for the summer semester. In the fall, she joins the Managing the Atom Project and International Security Program at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs as a research fellow where she will complete her dissertation.

Jack Ruina: A Leader Passes

Jack Ruina, Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering, MIT, passed away February 4, 2015. He was instrumental in establishing the MIT Security Studies Program and was its first Director. Prof. Ruina’s special interest was in strategic nuclear weapons policy. During his long career, he served on many government committees, including a presidential appointment to the General Advisory Committee, 1969-1977, and acted as Senior Consultant to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, 1977-1980. He also held the post of President of the Institute for Defense Analyses. At MIT, he has held the position of Vice President for Special Laboratories and was Secretary of the MIT Faculty.
Security studies is a broad subject, and the debates surrounding it necessarily involve academics, policymakers, and policy analysts. Social scientists, historians, scientists, and engineers all contribute to this rich and complex field. Thus, SSP is committed to reaching out to the broader national security policy community in order to build linkages among these diverse groups, enrich the learning experience of our students, and inform the security discourse. In 2014–15, these efforts included our weekly Wednesday Seminar Series where an array of speakers drawn from academia, government, and think tanks presented their current research and interacted in a question-and-answer session with SSP faculty and students. Supplementing these sessions were several dinners: including the Ruina Nuclear Age series with guest speaker, Ambassador Robert L. Gallucci, Distinguished Professor in the Practice of Diplomacy at Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service. Our faculty and senior researchers worked to inform the national security policy community about thinking within SSP; lecturing in such diverse locales as England, China, Germany and Australia; while also visiting Draper Laboratory for a series of presentations.

SSP is committed to the idea that our research must matter to real-world problems. To achieve this, we must maintain close contact with the broader security studies community.
The Wednesday Seminar Series

The Wednesday Seminar Series provides a forum for members of the MIT community to engage with an array of speakers drawn from the academic, think tank, and policy worlds working on security-related issues (a listing of the talks is provided below). Offered each Wednesday during the fall and spring semesters, the seminars are structured around a 45-minute speaker presentation followed by a 45-minute question-and-answer session. Audience members and speakers alike benefit from this arrangement. The audience, as one student put it, is able to learn “a lot about a topic in a short time,” while speakers gain insight into the debates and ongoing research at MIT by virtue of the Q&A sessions. Combined with post-seminar luncheons involving students, faculty, and the speaker, the Wednesday Seminar Series stands as a testament to SSP’s desire and ability to reach out to the broader security studies community.

**Fall 2014 Seminars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 10</td>
<td>Nora Bensahel, Center for a New American Security</td>
<td>Iraq, Syria, and the Role of the U.S. Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 17</td>
<td>Vijay Shankar, Vice Admiral of Indian Armed Forces</td>
<td>A Covenant sans Sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 24</td>
<td>Shai Feldman, Brandeis University</td>
<td>The IDF’s Doctrine and Force Structure: The Effects of the Gaza War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 1</td>
<td>Timothy Crawford, Boston College</td>
<td>Alignment Counterfactuals in the First World War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 8</td>
<td>Paul Staniland, University of Chicago</td>
<td>Governing Coercion: Armed Politics and the State in South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 15</td>
<td>David Holloway, Stanford University</td>
<td>Military strategy and nuclear deterrence in U.S.-Soviet relations, 1961-1972: a reassessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring 2015 Seminars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 22</td>
<td>Angela Kane, UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs</td>
<td>The United Nations and Disarmament: Old Problems, New Opportunities, and Challenges Ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 29</td>
<td>Dale Copeland, University of Virginia</td>
<td>Economic Interdependence and War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 5</td>
<td>Ana Arjona, Northwestern University</td>
<td>Social Order in Civil War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 19</td>
<td>Barbara F. Walter, UC San Diego</td>
<td>The Organization of Violence and Rebel Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 25</td>
<td>Steven Simon, Middle East Institute</td>
<td>The U.S. and the Middle East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each year the Security Studies Program hosts the Ruina Nuclear Age Dinner. The speaker series was endowed by Prof. Jack Ruina. Prof. Ruina was instrumental in establishing the MIT Security Studies Program and was its first director. This year’s honored guest speaker was Ambassador Robert L. Gallucci, Distinguished Professor in the Practice of Diplomacy at Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service. The topic of his presentation was “Nuclear Weapons: They’re Back.” Approximately 50 members of the SSP community including faculty, students and military fellows attended the dinner, held on October 27, 2014 at the Hotel Marlowe in Cambridge, MA.

Ruina Nuclear Age Series

Wednesday, March 4
Steven Wilkinson, Yale University
Topic: Army and Nation: coup-proofing the military in South Asia

Wednesday, March 11
Wendy Pearlman, Northwestern University
Topic: Protest Cascades in Syria

Wednesday, March 18
James Steinberg, Syracuse University
Topic: Strategic Reassurance and Resolve: U.S.-China Relations in the 21st Century

Wednesday, April 1
Sally Paine, Naval War College
Topic: China between Continental and Maritime World Orders

Wednesday, April 15
Charles Edel, Naval War College
Topic: Nation Builder: John Quincy Adams and the Grand Strategy of the Republic

Wednesday, April 29
Jonathan Caverley, MIT
Topic: Who’s Arming Asia, and Why it Matters

Robert L. Gallucci with Barry Posen
Russian Seminar Series

The MIT Security Studies Program, together with the MISTI MIT-Russia Program, and the MIT Center for International Studies, presented a speaker series entitled “Focus on Russia,” which considered a number of current issues in Russian politics and society.

October 28, 2014
Professor Karen Dawisha
Director, Havighurst Center for Russian and Post-Soviet Studies
Miami University, Oxford Ohio
“Putin’s Kleptocracy: Who Owns Russia?”

November 13, 2014
Professor Stephen Kotkin
Vice Dean, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University
“Stalin: Geopolitics, Power, Ideas”

November 18, 2014
Anna Arutunyan
Author, The Putin Mystique
“Kremlin Propaganda: Can Putin Control It”

February 6, 2015
Professor Mark Galeotti
New York University
“The Rise and (Apparent) Fall of the ‘Russian Mafia’”

February 27, 2015
Professor Matthew Rojansky
Director, Kennan Institute, Woodrow Wilson Center
“Reality Check: Russia, Ukraine, and the West in Crisis and Conflict”

March 17, 2015
Michele Rivkin-Fish
Associate Professor, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
“Fertility Surveillance and the Production of Families for the Nation: Russian Demographic Science and the Search for a Liberal Biopolitics”

May 04, 2015
Andrey Kortunov, President, Eurasia Foundation
“When the Dust settles: the Russian Foreign Policy after the Ukrainian Crisis”

SSP Senior Congressional and Executive Branch Staff Seminar

The Security Studies Program sponsored the 18th MIT Senior Congressional and Executive Office Branch Seminar “Renewal or Retrenchment: U.S. Grand Strategy in a Volatile World, April 8-10, 2015. The seminar brings Capitol Hill staffers to MIT for three days of panels and discussions on matters of national and international concern. It offers a chance for the Institute to display the depth of expertise within the department and programs.

This year the program sponsored 34 staffers for the event. The seminar was opened with a lunch with Keynote Speaker, Ambassador Karl Eikenberry, William J. Perry Fellow in International Security at the Center for International Security and Cooperation, Stanford University, and former U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan. The following evening, a dinner was held for the participants with speaker, Dr. Kathleen Hicks, Senior Vice President and Director, International Security Program at the center for Strategic and International Studies. Panels included discussions on Grand Strategy; International Security in Asia; Europe and the Renaissance of Russian Power; New Technology and Changing Dimensions of Military Power; and The Greater Middle East. A morning trip to Lincoln Laboratory was also included.

The seminar is made possible with a generous grant from the Frankel Foundation.

L-R, Richard Samuels, Vipin Narang, M. Taylor Fravel, Owen Coté
Two years since the Nuclear Studies Research Initiative’s (NSRI) inaugural conference in Austin, Texas, the scholarly renaissance in the field continues apace. The 2015 NSRI conference, held on the grounds of the Airlie Center in northern Virginia, brought together senior and junior historians and political scientists for three days of interdisciplinary intellectual exchange, mentorship, and networking. NSRI was created to support the resurgence in nuclear studies in the fields of history and political science. While nuclear studies fell out of vogue after the Cold War, many scholars, especially junior scholars, are now returning to the subject with new rigor and tackling questions that past generations left unanswered in an era of bipolar competition.

Participants presented working papers that challenged conventional wisdom. Topics ranged from the causes and consequence of proliferation to reappraisals of the theory of the nuclear revolution. Historians showcased new archival evidence that cast doubt on traditional interpretations of U.S.-USSR nuclear competition in the 1980s. Political scientists questioned existing theories of deterrence and alliance coercion. Still others brought new methodological tools to bear on long-standing questions about nuclear non-use. Experts on China shed light on Beijing’s nuclear strategy.

Colin Kahl, national security advisor to Vice President Biden, delivered a keynote address on the first day of the conference. He provided a detailed account of nuclear negotiations with Iran and assessed their impact on the region.

NSRI provides more feedback to scholars than most academic conferences. Each invited scholar prepares a working paper and reviews those of the other participants. Panelists critique and debate every paper in detail. This format maximizes the breadth and quality of comments that each scholar receives on his or her work.

The Carnegie Corporation and MacArthur Foundation provide generous support for NSRI, headed by Francis Gavin, Stanton Chair in Nuclear Security Policy Studies and Professor of Political Science at MIT.

The 2015 NSRI Conference brought scholars from different countries and academic disciplines into conversation about nuclear issues. The conference also highlighted NSRI’s orientation toward important current policy debates. The future of the interdisciplinary field of nuclear security studies looks bright.
Early Warning Newsletter

Early Warning, the Security Studies Program’s newsletter, is published four times a year. It contains articles pertaining to recent events in the Program as well as listing publications and speaking engagements for the Program’s faculty, students, and alumni. The most recent and past editions are posted online at the Program’s website: http://mit.edu/ssp/publications/early.html.
The Independent Activities Period (IAP)

The Independent Activities Period (IAP) is a special four-week term at MIT that runs from the first week of January until the end of the month. IAP has provided members of the MIT community (students, faculty, staff, and alumni) with a unique opportunity to organize, sponsor, and participate in a wide variety of activities. This year, SSP ran a four part series on contemporary military topics.

Thursday, January 15 – Inside the White House Situation Room
Unclassified discussion of the White House Situation Room focusing on evolution of the WHSR in its mission of giving direct, daily support to the President & National Security Staff. Topics include Origins of the WHSR in the Kennedy administration, Evolution of mission & support to the President in national security decision-making, and Overview of WHSR capabilities, personnel, facilities & technology.

Glenn Voelz, U.S. Army

Wednesday, January 21 – The Evolution of Aerial Bombing
The Evolution of Aerial Bombing (or How to Drop a Better Bomb in 90 Minutes or Less)
A seminar on the evolution of bombing methods in military aviation, focusing on the technological advancements from manual to computed bombing and the improvement of munitions from ‘dumb’ to ‘smart’ weapons. Topics include the Iron Sight, the Bombing Triangle, General Purpose munitions, and GPS weapons.

Stephane Wolfgeher, U.S. Air Force

Thursday, January 22 – Lessons Learned in Leadership
A military perspective on lessons learned in leadership and character for scientists, engineers, and introverts in general. Seminar discussion will cover the challenges and best practices of operating in the “human domain,” the art of providing candid feedback, techniques for mentoring others, and the role character plays in building great teams.

John Henderson, U.S. Army

Thursday, January 29 – The Art & Science of a Carrier Landing
With 600+ carrier landings & having “waived” countless landings as a Landing Signals Officer, CDR Bernacchi brings a wealth of expertise to the Art, Science & tech of landing fighters on an aircraft carrier. From fresnel lenses to the wind effect of the “Burble” to systems used in bad weather & at night, he links the Art & Science of Naval Aviation in a multimedia experience.

Ryan Bernacchi, U.S. Navy
SSP Activities—Engaging with the National Security Policy Community

Lectures at the MIT Lincoln Laboratory

Caitlin Talmadge
February 6, 2015

Explaining Military Effectiveness
Why are some states able to translate their national resources into military success, while others fail to do so? This question has important implications for U.S. defense strategy and foreign policy, yet the answers to it are not clear. Not only do we observe puzzling variation in the fighting effectiveness of similarly resourced national armies, but even the same army can vary tremendously in its effectiveness at different points in time or across different units. What can explain these patterns? After briefly reviewing how we can define and measure military effectiveness, Dr. Talmadge will discuss the major bodies of social science research on the subject. These include work on the roles of demography, national wealth, technology, the external threat environment, culture and society, political institutions, and civil-military relations. The talk will discuss what this existing research can help us understand about military effectiveness, as well as where this work falls short. Historical and contemporary examples will be used throughout, and the talk will close with a discussion of real-world implications for today.

Vipin Narang
July 10, 2015

Nuclear South Asia: Past, Present, and Future
How has mutual nuclearization affected the security competition between India and Pakistan? This talk explores the character of conflict between India and Pakistan before and after they acquired nuclear weapons, showing how Pakistan’s nuclear strategy has enabled it to change the way in which it pursues subconventional attacks against India, and how that strategy has paralyzed India’s conventional retaliatory options thus far. It further analyzes the efforts India is making to try to redress its inability to generate credible retaliatory and deterrent options against perceived Pakistan backed terrorism, as well as Pakistan’s attempts to close these so-called ‘deterrence gaps’. Ultimately, the action-reaction cycle will continue until there is a broader political solution and normalization between India-Pakistan.

Stephen Van Evera
May 1, 2015

U.S. strategy toward emerging threats: Russia/Ukraine and the Middle East
The largest long-term threat to U.S. national security remains the possibility of a WMD terror attack by al-Qaeda, by one of its franchise affiliates, or by an independent Sunni radical group (e.g., ISIS). This threat has been reduced by U.S. counterterror actions in recent years but has not been not eliminated. It remains more serious than threats posed by possible Chinese, Russian, or Iranian expansion, or by Assad’s Syrian regime. Efforts to address the WMD terror threat should accordingly take priority over efforts to address these other threats. The WMD terror threat is best addressed by both kinetic and non-kinetic counter-measures. More management and financial resources should be devoted to non-kinetic measures, including a war of ideas to defeat the jihadi narrative and efforts to end conflicts that feed al-Qaeda and its affiliates.
Faculty & Senior Researchers: Publications

Taylor Fravel


Frank Gavin

“Friends or Frenemies?” The American Interest, June 1, 2015.


Vipin Narang

Barry Posen
“Prelude to a Quagmire,” Foreign Policy, June 16, 2015.


Richard Samuels

Harvey Sapolsky

“JIEDDO: Thank You For Your Service,” realcleardefense.com, April 1, 2015.


Stephen Van Evera, Faculty


Jim Walsh


Cindy Williams
Faculty Awards

**Fotini Christia, faculty**
Named an Andrew Carnegie Fellow. Recipients will receive up to $200,000 each, which will enable them to devote between one and two years to research and writing. The project Christia is undertaking with Carnegie support is designed to gauge Shi’a public opinion towards conflict in the Middle East. Taking the occasion of Shiite religious pilgrimage sites in southern Iraq to survey observant Shiites both from Iran and from Iraq, Christia will gather and analyze the pilgrims’ attitudes towards their respective governments, the West and the U.S., as well as sectarian conflicts raging across the Middle East, including Iran’s nuclear program, and the rise of ISIS.

**Barry Posen, faculty**

**Richard Samuels, faculty**
Has been named a member of the U.S.-Japan Eminent Persons Group, Chaired by former U.S. Majority leader Thomas Daschle, former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Dennis Hastert, former Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda, and former Keidanren Chairman Fujio Mitarai, 2014-2015.
People and Financials
**Financials**

**MIT SSP**

*Revenue by Source of Funds*

- **Sponsored Funds**: 40.1%
- **Gifts**: 22.5%
- **Pool A Income**: 28.2%
- **Military Fellows**: 3.3%
- **Reimbursements**: 0.2%
- **Internal MIT Transfers**: 5.7%
- **Fellowships**: 3.3%
- **Publications**: 1.3%
- **Administrative and Office Expense**: 2.5%
- **Indirect Expense**: 7.2%
- **Student Support**: 4.3%
- **Administrative and Support Staff**: 6.4%
- **Faculty and Research Salaries***: 33.2%
- **Travel, Workshops Conferences**: 25.5%
- **Employee Benefits**: 11.2%

*Political Science faculty teaching salaries DO NOT appear in this graph.*
## Faculty, Fellows, and Staff

### 2014–15

#### Faculty and Senior Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fotini Christia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cfotini@mit.edu">cfotini@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Cote, Jr.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:owencote@mit.edu">owencote@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Taylor Fravel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fravel@mit.edu">fravel@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Gavin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fgavin@mit.edu">fgavin@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vipin Narang</td>
<td><a href="mailto:narangv@mit.edu">narangv@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Petersen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rpeters@mit.edu">rpeters@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry R. Posen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:posen@mit.edu">posen@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Rathjens</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwrathje@mit.edu">gwrathje@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Samuels</td>
<td><a href="mailto:samuels@mit.edu">samuels@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey M. Sapolsky</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sapolsky@mit.edu">sapolsky@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Emeritus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Van Evera</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vanevera@mit.edu">vanevera@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Walsh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j_walsh@mit.edu">j_walsh@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research Affiliates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Caverley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:caverley@mit.edu">caverley@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Gholz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:egholz@alum.mit.edu">egholz@alum.mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly M. Greenhill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kelly_greenhill@harvard.edu">kelly_greenhill@harvard.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Phil M. Haun</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philhaun@mit.edu">philhaun@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory D. Koblenz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gkoblent@gmu.edu">gkoblent@gmu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Krause</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pkrause@mit.edu">pkrause@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Miller</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicholas_miller@brown.edu">nicholas_miller@brown.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautam Mukunda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmukunda@hbs.edu">gmukunda@hbs.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Park</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jshpark@mit.edu">jshpark@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl G. Press</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgpress@sas.upenn.edu">dgpress@sas.upenn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjoern H. Seibert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:seibert@mit.edu">seibert@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cindywil@mit.edu">cindywil@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikako Ueki</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cueki@waseda.jp">cueki@waseda.jp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Senior Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Art</td>
<td><a href="mailto:art@brandeis.edu">art@brandeis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyom Brown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:seyomb@smu.edu">seyomb@smu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Cole</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrcole@umich.edu">jrcole@umich.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Guillemin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:guillemin@mit.edu">guillemin@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumi Hiwatari</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hiwatari@sophia.ac.jp">hiwatari@sophia.ac.jp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol R. Saivetz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:csaietz@mit.edu">csaietz@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Sokolsky</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sokolsky-j@rmc.ca">sokolsky-j@rmc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joli Divon Saraf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joli@mit.edu">joli@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elina Hamilton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elinah@mit.edu">elinah@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Levine</td>
<td><a href="mailto:llevine@mit.edu">llevine@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlene Miller</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harlenem@mit.edu">harlenem@mit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistant Director

SSP Seminar Series Coordinator

Administrative Assistant

Conference Coordinator

Administrative Assistant
Barry R. Posen is Ford International Professor of Political Science at MIT, Director of the MIT Security Studies Program [http://web.mit.edu/ssp/], and serves on the Executive Committee of Seminar XXI [http://semxxi.mit.edu/]. He has written three books, *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy*, *Inadvertent Escalation: Conventional War and Nuclear Risks*, and *The Sources of Military Doctrine*. The *Sources of Military Doctrine* won two awards: The American Political Science Association’s Woodrow Wilson Foundation Book Award, and Ohio State University’s Edward J. Furniss Jr. Book Award. He is also the author of numerous articles, including “Pull Back: The Case for a Less Activist Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, (Jan/Feb 2013) and “Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony,” *International Security*, (Summer, 2003.) He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He has been a Council on Foreign Relations International Affairs Fellow; Rockefeller Foundation International Affairs Fellow; Guest Scholar at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; Woodrow Wilson Center Fellow; Smithsonian Institution; Transatlantic Fellow of the German Marshall Fund of the United States, and Visiting Fellow at the John Sloan Dickey Center at Dartmouth College.

Fotini Christia joined the MIT faculty in the fall of 2008. She received her PhD in Public Policy at Harvard University. Fotini has done extensive ethnographic, survey and experimental fieldwork on ethnicity, conflict, and development in divided societies with a focus on Afghanistan and Bosnia-Herzegovina. She is presently conducting research on collective action and violence in Yemen and on sectarianism in Iraq. Fotini is the author of *Alliance Formation in Civil War*, published by Cambridge University Press in 2012, which received the Luebbert Award for Best Book in Comparative Politics, the Legold Prize for Best Book in International Relations and the Distinguished Book Award of the Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Migration Section of the International Studies Association. Her articles have been published in *Science*, in the *American Political Science Review*, and in *Comparative Politics* among other journals and her opinion pieces in *Foreign Affairs*, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. For her research, Fotini has received support from the International Growth Center, USAID, CIDA, the UN’s World Food program and the World Bank among others. She graduated magna cum laude with a joint BA in Economics-Operations Research from Columbia College and a Masters in International Affairs from the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University.

Owen R. Coté, Jr. joined the MIT Security Studies Program in 1997 as Associate Director. Prior to that he was Assistant Director of the International Security Program at Harvard’s Center for Science and International Affairs, where he remains co-editor of the Center’s journal, International Security. He received his Ph.D. from MIT, where he specialized in U.S. defense policy and international security affairs. He the author of *The Third Battle: Innovation in the U.S. Navy’s Silent Cold War Struggle with Soviet Submarines*, a book analyzing the sources of the U.S. Navy’s success in its Cold War antisubmarine warfare effort, and a co-author of *Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy: Containing the Threat of Loose Russian Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material*. He has written on the sources of innovation in military doctrine, the future of war, nuclear and conventional force structure issues, and the threat of nuclear terrorism.

M. Taylor Fravel is Associate Professor of Political Science and a member of the Security Studies Program at MIT. Taylor is a graduate of Middlebury College and Stanford University, where he received his PhD. He has been a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University, a Predoctoral Fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University, a Fellow with the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program and a Visiting Scholar at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He also has graduate degrees from the London School of Economics and Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar. In March 2010, he was named Research Associate with the National Asia Research Program launched by the National Bureau of Asian Research and the Woodrow Wilson International Center.
Francis J. Gavin is the first Frank Stanton Chair in Nuclear Security Policy studies and Professor of Political Science at MIT. Before joining MIT, Francis J. Gavin was the Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and the Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law at the University of Texas. From 2005 until 2010, he directed The American Assembly’s multiyear, national initiative, The Next Generation Project: U.S. Global Policy and the Future of International Institutions. He is the author of Gold, Dollars, and Power: The Politics of International Monetary Relations, 1958-1971 (University of North Carolina Press, 2004) and Nuclear Statecraft: History and Strategy in America’s Atomic Age (Cornell University Press, 2012). Gavin received a Ph.D. and M.A. in Diplomatic History from the University of Pennsylvania, a Master of Studies in Modern European History from Oxford University, and a B.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago. He has been a National Security Fellow at Harvard’s Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, an International Security Fellow at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, a Research Fellow at the Miller Center for Public Affairs at the University of Virginia, a Smith Richardson Junior Faculty Fellow in International Security and Foreign Policy, a Donald D. Harrington Distinguished Faculty Fellow at the University of Texas, a Senior Research Fellow at the Nobel Institute, and an Aspen Ideas Festival Scholar. He is a life member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Vipin Narang is an Associate Professor of Political Science at MIT and member of MIT’s Security Studies Program. He received his Ph.D. from the Department of Government, Harvard University in May 2010, where he was awarded the Edward M. Chase Prize for the best dissertation in international relations. He holds a B.S. and M.S. in chemical engineering with distinction from Stanford University and an M. Phil with Distinction in international relations from Balliol College, Oxford University, where he studied on a Marshall Scholarship. He has been a fellow at Harvard University’s Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, a predoctoral fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, and a junior faculty fellow at Stanford University’s Center for International Security and Cooperation. His research interests include nuclear proliferation and strategy, South Asian security, and general security studies. His work has been published in several journals including International Security, Journal of Conflict Resolution, and International Organization. His book, Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era: Regional Powers and International Conflict, was published by Princeton University Press in 2014.

Roger Petersen holds BA, MA, and PhD degrees from the University of Chicago. He has taught at MIT since 2001 and was recently named the Arthur and Ruth Sloan Professor of Political Science. Petersen studies comparative politics with a special focus on conflict and violence, mainly in Eastern Europe, but also in Colombia. He has written three books: Resistance and Rebellion: Lessons from Eastern Europe (Cambridge University Press, 2001), Understanding Ethnic Violence: Fear, Hatred, Resentment in Twentieth Century Eastern Europe (Cambridge University Press, 2002), and Western Intervention in the Balkans: The Strategic Use of Emotion in Conflict (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming 2011). He also has an interest in comparative methods and has co-edited, with John Bowen, Critical Comparisons in Politics and Culture (Cambridge University Press, 1999). He teaches classes on civil war, ethnic politics, and civil-military relations.

Richard J. Samuels is Ford International Professor of Political Science and director of the Center for International Studies. He has been head of the MIT Political Science Department, Vice-Chair of the Committee on Japan of the National Research Council, and chair of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission. He has also been elected to the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. His most recent book, 3.11: Disaster and Change in Japan, explores the response to the catastrophes in northeast Japan. Securing Japan: Tokyo’s Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia, was a finalist for the Lionel Gelber Prize for the best book in international affairs. Machiavelli’s Children won the Marraro Prize from the Society for Italian Historical Studies and the Jervis-Schroeder Prize from the International History and Politics section of American Political Science Association. Earlier books were awarded prizes from the Association for Asian Studies, the Association of American University Press, and the Ohira Memorial Prize. His articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs,
Jonathan Caverley’s research identifies incentives at the international and domestic levels for increased defense effort and militarized conflict, with an emphasis on U.S. foreign policy. He is currently examining how actors, particularly the United States, use the international arms trade and training of foreign militaries as tools of influence. His 2014 book, Democratic Militarism: Voting, Wealth, and War, examines the distribution of the costs of security within democracies, and its contribution to military aggressiveness.

Prior to his MIT appointment, he was Assistant Professor of Political Science at Northwestern, where he founded and co-chaired the Working Group on Security Studies at the Roberta Buffett Center for International and Comparative Studies. For the Fall 2013 and Winter 2014 academic quarters he served as a residential fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, in Washington, DC.

Caverley previously served eight years as a submarine officer in the U.S. Navy and as an Assistant Professor of Naval Science at Northwestern University, where he taught undergraduate classes in Naval Engineering and in Leadership and Management. His Ph.D. and M.P.P. are from the University of Chicago, and he received his A.B. in History and Literature from Harvard College.

Eugene Gholz is an Associate Professor at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. He works primarily at the intersection of national security and economic policy, on subjects including innovation, defense management, and U.S. foreign policy. From 2010-2012, he served in the Pentagon as Senior Advisor to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, where he led initiatives to better understand the complex defense supply chain and on reimbursement of industry’s Independent Research and Development (IR&D) expenditures. Before working in the Pentagon, he directed the LBJ School’s master’s program in global policy studies from 2007–10. 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. His recent scholarship focuses on energy security. He is also a research affiliate of MIT’s Security Studies Program, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and associate editor of the journal Security Studies. His PhD is from MIT.
Kelly M. Greenhill is Associate Professor at Tufts University and Research Fellow at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government. Greenhill holds an SM and a PhD from MIT, a CSS from Harvard, and a BA from UC Berkeley. She has held fellowships at Stanford’s Center for Security and Cooperation, at Harvard’s Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, and at the Belfer Center. Greenhill is author of Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion, and Foreign Policy (Cornell Studies in Security Affairs); and co-editor of Sex, Drugs, and Body Counts: The Politics of Numbers in Global Crime and Conflict (Cornell University Press). Her research has also appeared in a variety of journals, including International Security, Security Studies, Civil Wars, and International Migration, as well as in/on the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, the BBC, and in briefs prepared for the U.S. Supreme Court. She is currently writing a new book, a multi-method, cross-national study of unconventional sources of threat perception and proliferation.

Phil Haun is the Professor of Aerospace Studies (adjunct) and Commander of Air Force ROTC Detachment 009 at Yale University. Prior to this position he taught strategy and policy at the Naval War College. Dr. Haun received his Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His research interests include asymmetric interstate conflict, military coercion, economic sanctions, and air power theory. His book Coercion, Survival & War: Why Weak States Resist the United States has just been released by Stanford University Press. He is an active duty Colonel in the United States Air Force with extensive combat experience flying the A-10 “Warthog.” Professor Haun was a national security fellow at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. He holds an MA in Economics from Vanderbilt University and an AB in Engineering Science from Harvard University.

Gregory Koblentz is an Associate Professor in the School of Policy, Government, and International Affairs and Deputy Director of the Biodefense Graduate Program at George Mason University. During 2012-2013, he was a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. Dr. Koblentz is a Research Affiliate with the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a member of the Scientist Working Group on Chemical and Biological Weapons at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation in Washington, DC.

Prior to arriving at George Mason, Dr. Koblentz was a visiting assistant professor at Georgetown University. He has also worked for the Executive Session on Domestic Preparedness at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Dr. Koblentz is the author of Strategic Stability in the Second Nuclear Age (Council on Foreign Relations, 2014) and Living Weapons: Biological Warfare and International Security (Cornell University Press, 2009) and co-author of Tracking Nuclear Proliferation: A Guide in Maps and Charts (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1998). He received a PhD in political science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a MPP from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.
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