CHAPTER 2

COMPETITIVE STRATEGIES AS A TEACHING TOOL

Bernard I. Finel

Teaching Students about Policy.

One of the most difficult challenges facing faculty members in policy relevant disciplines is teaching students how to think about making policy. Certainly, professors are adept at explaining the ins and outs of the policy process. It is also easy enough to teach students about past policies and point out successes and failures. However, it is difficult to teach students how to devise policies which are both politically plausible and likely to succeed.

As a general rule, students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels fall into two traps in terms of thinking about policy. First, some students do not fully understand the context in which policy is made. They do not understand the cross-cutting pressures on decisionmakers, and have trouble assessing how given policy options affect interested parties. Second, many students are unalterably tied to the conventional wisdom. They confuse thinking about policy themselves with research on what people have recommended in the past. This reliance on conventional wisdom is pernicious and difficult to solve. Professors hoping to prepare their students for positions in the policy community must be able to communicate the conventional wisdom to their students. Analysts hoping to be successful must know what people are thinking and what are the bounds of acceptable opinion.

The proliferation issue provides a good example of the difficulty of teaching students about policy. On one hand, many students have difficulty understanding the constraints on proliferation policy. Although academics like

Kenneth Waltz and John Mearsheimer sometimes argue that the United States should either ignore or even encourage nuclear proliferation, advocating such policies is a sure way to be marginalized or worse in the policy community.[1] An academic program that allows its students to go out into the "real world" making such arguments is doing the student a fundamental disservice. More subtly, however, many students come out of policy programs believing that proliferation should be dealt with by using pre-emptive military strikes. This is a more acceptable option publicly, but is ultimately implausible for the United States simply because the American people are unlikely to accept a policy of unprovoked military attacks for moral reasons, especially when such attacks risk contaminating the vicinity of the target with radiation or chemical or biological toxins.[2]

By contrast, students whose professors and research are closer to the policy community often miss the forest for the trees. They are so focused on the details of the latest counterproliferation initiative of the Department of Defense (DoD), for instance, that they are unwilling to think about the problem of proliferation more broadly. These students believe that proliferation policy options are limited to those officially promulgated by the government or prominent research institutes.

Unfortunately, this division of would-be policymakers into those who are unaware of context and those who are completely tied to conventional wisdom hinders U.S. ability to develop effective and comprehensive policies to deal with proliferation. The key to dealing with policymaking in a complex world is to have a process for assessing the constraints and generating options. The competitive strategy (CS) framework is useful in generating new insights into policy options, and as a result is a valuable teaching tool for professors hoping to help students develop their ability to think about policy.[3]

Policymaking: Art or Science.

One of the great debates in the study of politics is whether policymaking is art or science. Do successful policymakers have some sort of special insight? Or are they simply more organized and supported by better staff?

Although many observers see a particular genius in the actions of statesmen like Metternich, Bismarck, or Kissinger, it is difficult to derive pedagogical implications from this position. If successful policymaking is an artistic skill concentrated in few gifted individuals, then how do we teach about policy and strategy? Does it even make sense to have academic programs in both government and universities to try to teach the policymaking art?

Art education is, of course, an important part of a liberal arts background. However, advanced study in the arts is only usually open to those of great talent. Prospective students to film schools and music conservatories must present evidence of their talent before admission. Should policy programs require applicants to demonstrate their strategic skills before being admitted? The suggestion seems bizarre, in part because although we may on occasion argue that strategy is an art, we accept that it is also something which can be taught.

In addition, policy, unlike art, can be assessed by examining the process of its creation. A policy can be successful, but still be bad policy if it is based on flawed assumptions and an incomplete assessment of options. Under these conditions, we might argue that the policymaker was lucky rather than good, and not worthy of emulation. True art, by contrast, is mysterious. It comes from within, and we are more concerned with the final product than with the process of its production.

Teaching policy as art also raises the problem that there is no good way to assess competing positions. Do you prefer the Impressionists or the Grand Masters? Is that even a coherent question? How would one begin to answer it? We

see the problem in public policy debates all the time. Proponents of competing positions will appear on Sunday morning talk shows and go at each other for half an hour, at the end of which everyone still believes what they believed going in. There is no good process for assessing policy as art.

Finally, the problem with thinking about policy and strategy as art rather than science is that art is more difficult to teach than science. The core of science is the scientific method of gathering evidence, positing and testing relationships, and then trying to expand the resulting insights to encompass broader empirical domains. Science relies on developing testable and comparable propositions. This forces analysts to make their assumptions and procedures explicit. As a result, a scientific approach lends itself both to teaching and assessment.

That said, there is no one answer to a policy problem. Not only are outcomes dependent on the interaction of different actors' choices, but there is often the problem of incomplete or inaccurate information. Even if decisionmakers use a clear process for assessing their environment and developing options, they risk policy failure due to unforeseen circumstances. Just because it is possible to think of the policy process as a science of sorts, does not mean that policy can be precise or always successful.

Carl von Clausewitz's writings deal with this particular problem. For him the key problem in war is making decisions under conditions of stress and uncertainty. In response, he argued for a synthesis between art and science. For Clausewitz there is a sort of military genius, but it is not something people are necessarily born with. He argues that one can learn about military affairs, how to assess a dangerous situation, how to make decisions, and how to persevere in the face of the fog of war. The successful military leader, for Clausewitz, is one who is able to harness his natural abilities and bolster them through experience. [4]

Clausewitz's writings suggest the importance of experiential learning. Unfortunately, experiential learning

is difficult to promote in most contexts. Many professional schools and programs use simulations and gaming to some extent to teach students. Many business schools use case studies as a central teaching tool, and some international affairs programs integrate political-military games into their curriculum at the margins. Ultimately, however, cost and resource limitations mean that most teaching will occur within the classroom and outside the realm of experiential learning.

The alternative to experiential learning is to teach students a process for thinking about strategy and policy. The competitive strategy methodology is very useful to help students think through policy options.

Competitive Strategy Methodology.

In contrast to traditional strategic planning, which is usually done on an *ad hoc* basis, and hence is susceptible to a variety of miscalculations and bad assumptions, competitive strategy is a systematic methodology designed to aid in planning for the future. Competitive strategy was developed to help corporations understand their environment, their own position, and the options they have to modify these two factors to improve their position.[5] The approach has now become common in business schools, and has been applied to international politics largely by a small group of analysts affiliated with the Office of Net Assessment in the Pentagon.[6]

In his original formulation of the approach, Michael E. Porter stressed the importance of firms understanding their comparative position in the marketplace. His approach rests on the assumption that market conditions vary considerably from sector to sector. What represents good performance in one sector, say a mature retail sector where 2-3 percent revenue growth per year is quite good, would be considered poor in the internet sector where the leading firms see revenue increases of 200-300 percent annually. Porter's main concern, however, was not with absolute

performance, but relative performance *vis-à-vis* both the market and competitors. For him, a market strategy was not geared toward either the market or competitors alone, but rather a successful strategy would examine the impact of actions on both. Furthermore, Porter stressed the importance of considering the strengths and weaknesses of both one's own firm and one's rivals, as well as the strategies and options available to each.

The competitive strategy approach was developed for a situation in which two or more firms compete in a given market. A market contains its own logic. Firms are *long-term* profit-maximizers. They compete for market share and returns on investment. Certainly, there may be some firms which fail to follow these goals, but they are likely to be eliminated from the competition rapidly. As a result, a marketplace is both self-regulating and self-reinforcing. In short, in a market, the goals of firms are inherently competitive. Certainly, there are some nonzero-sum outcomes, as with oligopolistic competition—such as situations where firms collude to keep prices high but even then, firms have little stake in the success of rivals since the collapse of other firms usually strengthens one's own position.

The competitive strategy approach was applied to international politics most successfully in assessing and managing the long-term competition with the former Soviet Union. To make the jump from market strategy to international politics, however, requires several key assumptions. The first assumption is that there is some sort of an overarching system or international environment in which all the relevant states exist. This is the equivalent of a given market or market sector. Second, using competitive strategy to plan for international politics assumes that there is some sort of on-going competition as exists inherently with firms in a marketplace. Third, competitive strategy makes fundamental assumptions about the nature of incentives and rewards in the international system.

Specifically, although there are possibilities of joint gains, states can also benefit from gaining at each other's expense.

Scholars of international affairs will note that the competitive strategy framework, therefore, makes many of the same key assumptions as neorealism.[7] However, the framework does not assume that the constraints are structural, but rather that the competitive system is fundamentally actor-generated as in some constructivist accounts of international politics. As a result, the competitive strategy framework for policy analysis is complementary to much of the existing theory about international politics. This is consistent with Porter's original intention of blending traditional, case study-style business analysis with more conceptual and rigorous findings of industrial economics.

The CS framework clearly differentiates between industry or system structure, and the unit level attributes of states and firms. The causal links between the two are bi-directional, and strategy mediates the effects of firm behavior on industry structure and of industry structure on state options. Strategy, in this context, is therefore not reducible to a simple set of rules. Strategy, in the CS framework, is dynamic and changing.

These points can best be explained by applying competitive strategy to international politics as discussed by David Andre in his important article on this subject. Andre has derived fourteen sets of questions.[8] They can roughly be divided into three groups: questions about the international system, questions about the individual or unit-level attributes of the competitors, and questions about strategic choice and strategic interaction.

Without a methodology for providing answers, CS is not a useful tool for strategic planning or for teaching about policy. Students need to be taught precisely how to assess the relevant factors in each of the three levels of analysis. Ultimately, the single greatest limitation on using CS as a teaching tool in the foreign policy area is the lack of

methodologically self-conscious work in the field. This is particularly problematic because many of the key terms in CS as applied to international politics are vague. CS requires analysts to examine the nature of the global strategic environment as well as the proclivities, strengths, and weakness of states. Experienced analysts may be able to address such issues effectively, but most students will need more guidance to use CS effectively.

The following sections build on Andre's work by addressing methods for answering his questions. Both strategic planners and academics hoping to use CS as a teaching tool must consider systemic ways of answering questions about competition and strategy. Asking the questions is merely an important first step. However, since the CS framework does suggest certain key questions, it also allows us to think systematically about how to approach planning for an on-going competition. Analysts should also draw upon the vast body of scholarship on international politics to help structure their answers to the CS framework. The following sections suggest some of the relevant literature.

Understanding the International System.

When we speak about industry structure, there are a set of easily definable variables to examine. The four key questions firms face in assessing their environment are: (1) How many firms are competing in a given industry?; (2) Are the barriers to entry for new firms high or low?; (3) Are significant economies of scale possible?; and, (4) How strong is the threat of substitute products or services?[9]

If there are many firms, low barriers to entry, few economies of scale, and a significant threat of substitute products, we can expect the market to approach perfect competition, and profit margins to be relatively low. Industries with few firms, high barriers, large economies of scale, and no substitute products often lead to oligopolies or monopolies and high profit margins.

At this point we do not have analytical tools to assess international politics with the same degree of precision. Furthermore, since there is no common goal of nations equivalent to the role of profits for firms, it is more difficult to provided generalizable linkages between international structure and policy outcomes. That said, however, it is possible to discuss some basic variables in the international system and how they affect specific policy options.

When we speak about international structure and structural variables, we are discussing factors which persist and are not immediately changeable by state decisions. System structure does change, and states can, through their choices, modify the international system. However, this takes a long time, usually 10-15 years at a minimum.

In trying to define the international environment, we can specify a few key variables. The first variable to consider is the number of important actors active on a given issue. When speaking of the international system as a whole, this variable is usually referred to as polarity. Scholars of international affairs have suggested that polarity is linked to alliance behavior, the likelihood of war, and balancing behavior.[10] In addition, scholars have suggested that the number of actors affects the possibility of cooperation, although the effects are conceptually ambiguous.[11] Many observers have identified the bipolar nature of the Cold War as being an important variable in explaining both its substance and persistence over nearly 45 years.[12] The second variable is the presence or absence of functioning international institutions.[13] Although some scholars have argued that institutions are largely irrelevant, or at least that they are likely to fail under any sort of major stress, most issues in the world today are governed by some sort of international institutions. Institutions can be formal organizations such as the United Nations, or implicit or explicit rules of behavior such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) regime. International institutions can serve as a significant source of power in the international system, and states need to assess whether and under what

conditions they can use regimes to leverage their own resources. The United States, for instance, has long used the formal institution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a way to increase its power and influence in Europe.

The third variable, particularly in security relations, is the utility of force in the international system. At a structural level the utility of force is constrained by the offense-defense balance, which is the perceived or real advantage of either offensive uses of force or defensive uses of force.[14] When defense is dominant or seen as such, force is less usable. When offense is dominant, not only is war more likely, but such secondary effects as arms races and pressures for preemption also occur. The utility of force, however, is also affected by the existence of norms, that is, definitions of appropriate behavior defined in terms of rights and obligations. Norms are important in determining whether states will be able to legitimize uses of force. Saddam Hussein's failure to heed the global norm against unprovoked aggression allowed the United States to build the coalition against Iraq during the Gulf War.

The fourth variable is the existence of a dominant understanding of strategy. Like norms, strategic thinking is an ideational variable, but unlike norms it does not necessarily contain a definition of rights and obligations. Rather, strategic ideas often reflect shared beliefs about states' definition of interests. The general acceptance of mercantilism in the 17th century is an example of shared strategic thinking functioning as a structural variable. Mercantilism posited that economic relations were zero-sum; this is distinct from the currently dominant school of neo-classical economics which sees trade as positive-sum by definition.

These four variables largely define the international system. By examining these variables, strategic planners can begin to assess three sets of issues. First, the structure of the international systems helps planners assess their

own interests. When offense is dominant, for instance, planners need to worry about the threat of attack more than when defense is dominant. Hence in an offense-dominant world, "hard" security concerns take precedence over "softer" issues such as economics and individual welfare. Second, similarly, the international system helps planners understand the interests of other states. Third, the structure of the international system helps planners understand some of the factors which either help or constrain specific policy instruments. When force is perceived as being less legitimate, for instance, it behooves planners to consider the political ramifications of using force as well as the military effects. Ultimately, students and analysts must determine for themselves which variables they consider important in determining system structure, but it is imperative that they do so explicitly and with a clear understanding of how their variables interact to create constraints or incentives for states.

Unit-Level Variables.

When looking at unit-level variables in firms, Porter suggests the importance of examining sustainable areas of competitive advantage. Porter observed that profitability is related directly to cost and price issues: How cheaply can the firm produce a given good or service, and how much can it charge for that good or service? To be profitable, firms must develop a strategy that either allows them to produce goods and services less expensively than their competitors or allows them to distinguish their goods and services from their competitors'. This differentiation allows firms to charge a premium for their unique products. Porter also stresses the importance of thinking strategically about how a firm can improve its position over the long term.

For states, the analytical framework is much more complex. Not only are goals varied, but it is difficult if not impossible to specify strategies fruitfully *a priori*. Nevertheless, the CS framework does suggest a series of

unit-level variables to consider when assessing the state's position and goals.

The first variable is the nature of the state's goals. Ideally, a strategic planner should be able to develop a hierarchy of goals for the state. The difficulty occurs because states have goals across a wide range of issues and *vis-à-vis* a large number of other actors. It may be possible to harmonize preferences, although this is rarely done in fact, in part due to the diffuse nature of policy formulation in modern, bureaucratic states. Furthermore, if each issue has a fall-back position, then the situation becomes more complex. CS requires a consideration of the full complexity of competing primary and secondary goals.

For instance, in the case of the U.S. intervention in Kosovo, American leaders decided that given a tradeoff between good short-term relations with Russia and stopping Serb aggression, it was more important to secure the latter than the former. However, this decision relied on two important assumptions: (1) U.S. intervention would stop Serb aggression, and (2) relations with Russia could be repaired at some point in the future. But what if the U.S. intervention was incapable of restraining, or unlikely to stop, the Serbs? What if intervening against Serbia led to a long-term rupture in U.S.-Russian relations? In both issue areas, it is easy to specify a set of transitively ordered preferences, but developing contingent preferences, and then weighing the likelihood of various outcomes to produce an expected utility based preference ordering is extremely difficult. Nevertheless, sound strategic planning must begin by trying to define goals on issues and toward actors which interact as a first step to developing a comprehensive matrix of preferences.

The second variable is the state's resources. Traditional, realist analyses of international relations focus on the concept of "power" as an important variable. This approach sees power as a commodity or basket of commodities, for instance, military power or economic power. This approach

can be criticized on three fundamental grounds. First, to the extent that power has demonstrable effects on behavior, the concept must be thought of in terms of social relationships. The raw resources which support power are only effective in specific political contexts over a limited range of issues. Second, since power has a contextual element, it is probably less fungible than the commodity approach suggests. Third, since power has a social aspect, the concept of power can be expanded into the realm of soft power, that is, influence flowing from cultural or social attraction, leadership by example, and the power of persuasion.[15] This more complex notion of power ultimately provides leverage into understanding the sorts of strengths a state brings to bear on a particular competitive relationship. Kenneth Timmerman's interesting recommendations on policy toward Iran are a good example of the sort of complex thinking the notion of power suggests.[16] He points to the importance of democracy as a tool in the U.S. foreign policy arsenal. Not only is democracy a persisting source of strength for the United States socially, it is also a source of power *vis-à-vis* nondemocratic states through the power of cultural attraction. Democracy sells, and to the extent that supporting democracy allows the United States to undermine hostile elites, it becomes a lasting source of power.

This notion of power is also related to Porter's focus on enduring sources of strategic advantage and core competencies. What is a strategic advantage or core competency other than power? Clearly the concepts are linked. As a result, it would be fruitful for students of international politics interested in applying the competitive strategy approach to delve into the rich literature on the sources of power between states. The goal of this review would be to consider how different types of power interact with one another. Ultimately, strategic thinking must aim to develop a typology of power resources organized by utility in different strategic contexts and across different substantive issues. Although branding is a powerful

competitive strategy for businesses, its utility is ultimately determined by such issues as whether products are differentiable, substitutable, and fungible. Sometimes branding is the wrong approach. Similarly, in international politics, military power is a useful tool, but will play virtually no role in international trade negotiations between close allies. To be useful, however, this sort of assessment of the utility of various resources must be systematic rather than idiosyncratic. Knowing that power is context specific is a basic requirement of a CS approach, but it is not sufficient.

Developing a typology of the utility of various instruments of influence allows analysts to begin to think about how states can change their competitive positions. Focusing on core competencies can have the unintended consequence of inhibiting effective planning. Core competencies are not just extant capabilities but also potential ones. Therefore, analysts and policymakers must think not only in terms of existing strengths but also in terms of potential strengths. But the desirability of these potential strengths is itself a function of the previously described assessment of the utility of various power resources in different contexts and *vis-à-vis* the resources of competing actors.

The notion of developing new core competencies suggests the importance of time as a key element in strategy. The question for strategists is whether they can develop dominant resources faster than opponents can develop countermeasures. The U.S. military already thinks in these terms. Speeding up the observation, orientation, decision, action (OODA) loop is a central factor in military strategy and rests at the core of the current revolution in military affairs (RMA). OODA loops also exist in business planning, and at the national strategic level. The CS approach to international politics is useful in orienting analysts to think about time as an element of strategy. Unfortunately, there is virtually no existing literature about how states' core competencies change over time,

whether these changes can be affected by deliberate decisions, or the factors which either speed or slow the OODA loop at the national strategic level.

This lack of conceptual work on core competencies at the national level makes CS difficult to use as a prescriptive tool, but its utility can be demonstrated through its use as an explanatory framework. For instance, the German decision to develop a sea-going fleet prior to World War I can be seen as an attempt to shift Germany's core competency from land power to naval power in the hopes to modifying the balance of power toward Great Britain. However, the British had both the resources and expertise to stay a step ahead of the Germans in the naval race, first by developing the *Dreadnought* class battleship and then by accelerating their own construction programs in the face of the German challenge. For Germany, hemmed in by British naval power but desiring a larger role in the world, shifting the competition was potentially a reasonable policy. However, Britain's existing strength in the naval arena and rapid strategic OODA loop made the German policy counterproductive.[17]

Germany's failure resulted, in part, from her leaders' misunderstandings about Britain. Britain, for both historical and ideological reasons, was particularly likely to respond strongly to a challenge to her naval dominance. Although British leaders were willing throughout the latter part of the 19th century to make concessions to potential rivals, they never made important concessions on any issues which threatened British naval supremacy. In short, the British had an existing propensity to try to appease potential rivals, but not in the naval arena.

The understanding and manipulation of propensities is at the core of CS. The goal of CS is to leverage your strengths against an opponent's weaknesses, and force them into a costly competition. This was precisely the notion behind the development of SDI as a competitive tool against the former Soviet Union. The former Soviet Union had a lasting

propensity to try to match the United States symmetrically in arms competitions. This propensity was a result of Soviet lessons of the past (particularly the Cuban Missile Crisis), ideology (the importance placed on being seen as a "leading" power), and bureaucratic politics (the strength of the military-industrial complex within the upper echelons of the Soviet state). Pushing the Soviets into a high-tech arms race forced the former Soviet Union to compete in areas of weakness compared to the United States. Not only did the United States have a more advanced and robust technological base, it had a much larger economy and was better able to bear the strains of a costly military build-up.

There is an extensive developing literature on national propensities. Many scholars are currently examining the topic of "strategic culture."[18] The work in this area is well positioned to inform students using CS about how to assess and study the strategic propensities of states.

Strategic Choice and Strategic Interaction.

Having discussed international or systemic constraints and the domestic attributes which bound long-term competition, it is important to consider the linkages between the two. In this regard it is useful to remember that the key insight of strategic thinking is that policy choices interact to create outcomes which none of the actors individually preferred or expected. The notion of strategic interaction makes clear that outcomes are a function of how preferences interact rather than individual choices.

This insight is perhaps most keenly illustrated in the work of Thomas Schelling.[19] Schelling has been maligned unjustly for the role his notions of signaling played in the development of strategy during the Vietnam War. Although it is quite easy to misuse game theoretic approaches to politics, Schelling's work and those of other analysts using similar methods remain an important contribution to thinking about strategy. His work highlights the role of

interaction effects, unintended consequences, and communicative issues on strategic outcomes.

In many ways, the CS approach requires a thought process similar to the game theory and rational choice approaches to politics. In both cases, analysts must try to specify preferences and strategic options. Game theory pushes the logic further by demonstrating how different patterns of preferences and choices lead to different outcomes, some of which are individually rational but collectively irrational. A properly done CS analysis will resemble a game theory model even if it is written in prose rather than formalized with mathematics.

In particular, CS required the development, at least implicitly, of decision trees listing options and expected countermoves. Certainly, CS does not require formalized utility functions, and mathematically derived equilibria, but a decision tree would help clarify expected outcomes.

Competitive Strategy as a Pedagogical Tool.

The competitive strategy approach is clearly a powerful tool of analysis. It provides a comprehensive set of questions to consider in policy planning and, when applied to international politics, is suggestive about methods and issues to consider in answering these questions.

Teaching students about policy is extremely difficult. Students, as a general rule, prefer to think about policy as either a process with clearly definable steps and rules, for instance, the federal budget process, or in terms of ideal policy preferences. The problem in teaching about policy is to makes students aware of how the possible affects the desirable. Students and other observers are often too critical of existing policy. Being outside the process, they have difficulty conceiving of the cross-cutting constraints on decisionmakers at each stage of the policy process. However, students are also too prone to accept the

conventional wisdom, which is often neither imaginative nor textured enough to incorporate complex value tradeoffs.

The CS framework, because it is a formalized methodology, forces students to think through the broader pressures and opportunities on policy. It ultimately serves an integrative purpose. This is particularly useful for cases in which stakes in a given policy area are scattered among different groups. For instance in the proliferation area, the counterproliferation community around the DoD tends to focus almost exclusively on either military counterproliferation (the use of force) or on mitigating the effects of proliferation through passive and active defense measures. By contrast, the arms control community sees the proliferation problem as one of international law and verification. Given the existence of two competing camps with different core assumptions about preferred outcomes and policy instruments, it is easy to see why non- and counter-proliferation policy is so difficult to make and understand, and why courses on this topic tend to be so unsatisfactory.

By applying a CS framework, professors can force students to engage in a rigorous consideration of constraints, options, and strategic interaction effects. Although students may object that the CS framework forces them to examine issues which seem to be outside the scope of their interests, the method of inquiry is as important as the ultimate findings.

The CS framework also suggests the importance of thinking about constraints, options, and strategic interaction in a conceptually and empirically valid manner. Providing a check list of questions is merely a first step. Unless there exists some sort of process to answer the questions in a generalizable way, the questions themselves are unlikely to serve as a fruitful prompt to creative thinking. Michael Porter's goal in developing CS was to link existing thinking about business strategy to the findings of rigorous academic economists. Similarly, in the political

sphere, CS provides a useful way to integrate theory with policy concerns.

Ultimately, a course using CS to examine a policy issue might be organized around a methodological discussion of CS, followed by case studies, country briefings, team exercises, and presentations. The methodological discussion would seek to examine CS as an analytical tool and introduce students to the key concepts and questions. The case studies in CS would present students with a series of policy recommendations and ask them to use the CS framework to critique the policies. The country briefings would be designed to help students work through an assessment of a country's goals, strengths and weaknesses, and propensities. The team exercises would serve the purpose of having students "red team" each other's analyses.

Conclusions.

CS is a useful tool for teaching students about policy and strategy. Although the existing materials are more geared toward professionals than students, it is possible to bolster the existing literature with classroom discussions and exercises and with the large body of scholarship on relevant international issues. CS holds promise in helping students to think about developing plausible policy options without falling into the trap of uncritically accepting conventional wisdom.

CHAPTER 2 - ENDNOTES

1. Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Be Better*, Adelphi Paper 171, London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1980; John J. Mearsheimer, "The Case for a Ukrainian Nuclear Deterrent," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3, Summer 1993, pp. 50-66.

2. For a discussion of some of these issues, see Charles A. Horner and Barry R. Schneider, "Counterforce," in Peter L. Hays, *et al*., eds., *Countering the Proliferation and Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1998, pp. 239-252.

3. On the application of competitive strategies to international politics, see David J. Andre, "Competitive Strategies: An Approach Against Proliferation," in Henry Sokolski, ed., *Fighting Proliferation: New Concerns for the Nineties,* Maxwell Air Force Base: Air University Press, 1996, pp. 257-276.

4. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War,* Michael Howard and Peter Paret, eds. and trans., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989, pp. 100-112.

5. The application of competitive strategies in the business field is most closely associated with the work of Michael E. Porter. Michael E. Porter, *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors,* New York: Free Press, 1980.

6. Andre, pp. 259-260.

7. The classic text of neorealism is Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979. For criticisms, see Robert Keohane, ed., *Neorealism and Its Critics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986; David A. Baldwin, *Neorealism and Neoliberalism,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

8. Andre, pp. 271-272.

9. Porter, pp. 3-33.

10. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, pp. 102-128.

11. Some scholars suggest that the more actors in a given system, the more difficult it is to achieve cooperation simply because of the incremental difficulty of getting each additional actor to accede to the proposed agreement. Other scholars, however, have suggested that with more actors, the relative gains problem becomes less difficult because states are less able and less likely to measure their position against that of any one other state. See Duncan Snidal, "Relative Gains and the Pattern of International Cooperation," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 85, September 1991, pp. 701-726.

12. John Lewis Gaddis, *The Long Peace,* New York: Oxford University Press, 1987, pp. 216-223.

13. For an extensive debate on this topic, see the articles by John J. Mearsheimer, Robert O. Keohane, Lisa L. Martin, Charles A. Kupchan, Clifford A. Kupchan, John Gerald Ruggie, and Alexander Wendt in *International Security*, Winter 1994-95.

14. Stephen Van Evera, "Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War," *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 4, Spring 1998, pp. 5-43.

15. The concept of "soft power" is most closely associated with the work of Joseph S. Nye, Jr. See, for instance, *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power,* New York: Basic Books, 1990, pp. 29-35.

16. Kenneth R. Timmerman, "Opportunities for Change in Iran," in Sokolski, ed., *Fighting Proliferation*, pp. 229-238.

17. For an extended discussion, see Paul M. Kennedy, *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism, 1860-1914,* London: Ashfield Press, 1980, pp. 410-431.

18. For a good review of the existing literature, see Michael C. Desch, "Culture Clash: Assessing the Importance of Ideas in Security Studies," *International Security,* Vol. 23, No. 1, Summer 1998, pp. 141-170.

19. See, in particular, Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960, pp. 83-118.