
International Security Studies: Looking Back and Moving Ahead

ROBERT L. PFALTZGRAFF, JR., AND
RICHARD H. SHULTZ, JR.

1971—ESTABLISHING A NEW FIELD AT FLETCHER

As a field of study, International Security Studies (ISS) entered the multidisciplinary Fletcher School Curriculum in 1971. Therefore, ISS has existed for forty-two years of The Fletcher School's eighty-year history. Below, we survey the evolution of ISS at Fletcher, focusing on how the field has adapted to, anticipated, and transcended the dynamic global security environment from the Cold War to the twenty-first century.

The founders of ISS recognized that an international curriculum should reflect as fully as possible the fact that we live in a world containing diverse actors, interests, and values contending for power, status, prestige, and security. International relations encompasses the study of war and peace, as well as of conflict and cooperation. This includes both historic and contemporary issues together with politics and other disciplines, as well as theories and strategies about conflict and war.

Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., is Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies, The Fletcher School, and President of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis. Shortly after joining the faculty in 1970, he helped to establish International Security Studies at Fletcher. His most recent book is *Anticipating a Nuclear Iran: Challenges for U.S. Security* (Columbia University Press, 2013). **Richard H. Shultz, Jr.**, is Professor of International Politics. He became a member of The Fletcher School faculty in 1983. Since 1989 he has been Director of International Security Studies at Fletcher. His more recent book is *The Marines Take Anbar: The Four Year Fight Against al-Qaeda* (Naval Institute Press, 2013).

ISS first appeared in the 1971-1972 Fletcher Bulletin as Field 13, consisting of seventeen courses, seven of which were offered for the first time as a part of the ISS core curriculum. Others were directly related, although cross-listed in other fields as well, thus establishing ISS from

.....
*The founders of ISS
 recognized that an
 international curriculum
 should reflect as fully as
 possible the fact that we live
 in a world containing diverse
 actors, interests, and values
 contending for power, status,
 prestige, and security.*

the outset as a field within Fletcher's multidisciplinary curriculum. Fletcher already had international security courses, such as Use and Limitations of Force. By 1971, many of the building blocks for the ISS field, including a substantial number of MALD theses and Ph.D. dissertations on political-military security-related topics, were already in place. Even before ISS came into existence, Fletcher hosted mid-career military fellows and degree military students. The Fletcher curriculum, however, lacked a cohesive, integrated

international security studies field. As stated in the initial grant proposal dated February 15, 1971: "The Fletcher School has until now had no coordinated and defined program of studies enabling a candidate for a graduate degree to concentrate on security affairs, and we know of no school which offers such a program."¹

The proposal defined "International Security Affairs" as "the study of the evolution and impact of the threat or use of organized force in sub-national, national, and international affairs, including concerns and efforts for the limitation, termination, or elimination of the use of such force." As outlined in the proposal, the international security studies field would contain courses on such topics as strategy, decision-making processes and instruments, technology and weapons development, subversion and internal security, intelligence and information, revolutionary warfare and "wars of national liberation," military intervention, nuclear-related issues, civil-military relations, problems of peacemaking and peacekeeping, and the role of international organizations in the establishment and maintenance of international stability and security.²

As stated in the initial proposal, the relevance of the ISS field was based on the assumption that "more than a peripheral understanding of the realities of military power" is needed if our students "are to serve effectively in the careers for which they prepare." It was then pointed out that some fifteen percent of each Fletcher class consisted of mid-career U.S.

government personnel, including military and civilians. The large number of international students at Fletcher also stood to benefit from the existence of the ISS field as part of a multidisciplinary international curriculum, thus broadening its potential interest and impact.

International Security Studies at Fletcher came into existence at an inauspicious time. In the early 1970s, the United States was deeply divided by the Vietnam War. The division manifested itself on the Tufts University campus and elsewhere in academia in the form of demonstrations, protests, and boycotts, as well as outright hostility to and normative biases against the study of defense and military affairs, as if avoiding such topics would somehow make war and conflict go away. As the initial grant proposal put it, "Paradoxically at a time when an understanding of political-military security has never been more important, such issues are often ignored in American education or actually shunned in revulsion against the factor of force in international affairs." Dean Edmund A. Gullion experienced the firebombing of his office in early 1971 by perpetrators from outside the university, resulting in the destruction of memorabilia and other possessions accumulated over a distinguished Foreign Service career. Nevertheless, he and others at Fletcher and elsewhere were undeterred and pressed forward. An abiding belief in the importance of the political-military dimension of the study of international relations transcended the anti-Vietnam passions that often spilled over into an aversion against the study of international security.

The division manifested itself on the Tufts University campus and elsewhere in academia in the form of demonstrations, protests, and boycotts, as well as outright hostility to and normative biases against the study of defense and military affairs, as if avoiding such topics would somehow make war and conflict go away.

CURRICULAR STRUCTURE AND INITIAL COURSE OFFERINGS

Beginning in 1971, in addition to Role of Force, the ISS field included courses on the evolution of military doctrines, arms control and disarmament, peacekeeping, crisis management, information in national security policymaking, the politics of insurrection, and science and technology in American foreign policy. ISS had access to regional studies courses focused on the Middle East, Europe and the Soviet Union, China, Japan, Latin

America, and Africa, as well as courses on modern radical and revolutionary ideologies and comparative political systems and foreign policies. The Fletcher field structure was ready-made both to benefit from and contribute to international security studies. Thus, from the outset there was intellectual synergism between ISS and other fields in the Fletcher curriculum that provided unprecedented opportunities to study the nature and origins, as well as the political, historical, cultural, economic, and legal dimensions of armed conflict and war. Then and now, ISS has furnished a substantive, conceptual, and methodological basis for the analysis of international security in its academic setting, while also preparing the would-be decision-maker to deal with the political-military dimension of foreign policy.

Given that the development of academic disciplines and subfields responds to contextual needs, it was perhaps inevitable that ISS would reflect the prevailing global political-military landscape. The advent of nuclear weapons, with their unprecedented lethality and the consequent need for new thinking about deterrence of international conflict in light of the intense East-West rivalry, and the development of competing alliance systems, together with low-intensity conflict and “wars of national liberation” in developing countries, spawned new literatures, studies, and expertise about these and many other security-related topics. The Cold War, together with a burgeoning need for knowledge across a broad spectrum of issues, disciplines, and regions, produced a larger interest in national security than had existed at any previous time.

An unprecedented expansion of the community of academics, security analysts, and specialists accompanied the post-World War II transformation of the United States into a superpower, with civilian strategists and defense policy professionals emerging as security assumed primary national importance. The development of seminal political-military thinking as a result of the advent of nuclear weapons and the Cold War was reflected first in the think-tank world with the establishment of the RAND Corporation shortly after the end of World War II. Subsequently, courses on issues of national security such as defense policy, military technology, and national security strategy were developed. By the 1960s, the public policy landscape was populated by a growing number of think-tanks and research organizations that came into existence to produce a broad array of studies, reports, briefings, and conferences on defense-related topics.

Shortly after the creation of ISS, the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA) was founded in Cambridge in 1976. An independent organization with offices in Cambridge and Washington, D.C., IFPA has worked with ISS within a broader policy community to produce innovative studies,

reports, briefings, publications, workshops, and conferences on national security and foreign policy issues. Like the ISS curriculum, the IFPA research agenda has always included a broad range of topics, including high- and low-intensity conflict, nuclear proliferation, special operations forces, strategy and weapons systems, and regional security settings such as the Middle East and the Asia-Pacific area, Cold War-era NATO Europe, and post-Cold War southeastern Europe.

The emergence of the United States as a superpower with global interests and commitments brought into focus many intersecting security problems and topics that helped shape the ISS curriculum. These included not only the economic aspects of defense policy and budgets, but also the interests, geographical circumstances, histories and strategic cultures of allies and adversaries. The study of international security would have been incomplete without the integration of a diverse array of perspectives across the several disciplines that constitute Fletcher's multi-disciplinary curriculum. This diversity set us apart from academic institutions organized primarily along traditional disciplinary lines such as political science, history, economics, and law, which together form the academic disciplinary pillars of the Fletcher curriculum.

While the immediate context was the Cold War, Fletcher's ISS field had a broader set of parameters because its conceptual basis extended far beyond the Cold War in both scope and time. ISS was grounded in the study of strategy, which dates from the ancient world to the twenty-first century, from Sun Tzu's writings on strategy and Thucydides' history of the Peloponnesian War to the present, from states to actors other than states. Faculty research interests in the ISS field, taken from a 1971 listing, are illustrative. Closely paralleling course offerings, research included such enduring topics as: surprise and deception in war, the role of information and intelligence in military decision-making, civil-military relations, uses and control of the seas, and the transfer and proliferation of conventional arms. Anticipating the twenty-first-century multinuclear setting, ISS faculty interests and courses spanned not only the nuclear capabilities and strategies of the United States and the Soviet Union, but also smaller nuclear states, namely France, the United Kingdom, and China. As reflected in the ISS curriculum, the security paradigm of the twenty-first century considers not only the many nuclear states, but also non-state armed groups seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Beginning in its early years, the ISS field included issue-focused courses on topics such as crisis management, arms control, and regional security with special emphasis on NATO and transatlantic relations, as well

as the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Fletcher also expanded its fields in Southwest Asia-Middle East and Asia Pacific studies. Such fields neatly complement ISS, for they address the crucially important historic, cultural, social, and economic factors shaping the local and regional settings in which armed conflicts are waged.

In sum, Fletcher's ISS curriculum has been based on the recognition that, while the nature of conflict and war is unchanging, the means by which wars are fought, as well as the types of actors involved, transform

.....

Therefore, one of war's enduring characteristics is that it is a struggle between opposing wills, strategies, and capabilities in which the goal of one side is to dominate and subdue the other and to make the opponent "incapable of further resistance."

.....

from one era to the next. New technologies provide new capabilities and establish the basis for new strategies with which to conduct armed conflict, as Karl von Clausewitz recognized in his work *On War*. Clausewitz also reminds us, however, that war is the pursuit of political goals by means that include the threat or actual use of force. Therefore, one of war's enduring characteristics is that it is a struggle between opposing wills, strategies, and capabilities in which the goal of one side is to

dominate and subdue the other and to make the opponent "incapable of further resistance." Clausewitz writes that war is "an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will."³

In the late-1980s, to capture these enduring characteristics of conflict and war, the ISS faculty introduced a course called "Origins, Conduct, and Termination of War." The course examined six historical case studies, beginning with the Peloponnesian War, through the lens of military strategy and political theory. However, in the 1980s the ISS curriculum also reflected the changing means through which war was conducted, including the study of non-state actors' use of terrorism and other instruments of irregular warfare. Thus, ISS students studied armed conflict both between states and between state and non-state armed groups, along with the strategies, motivations, and capabilities shaping each groups' behavior, in both historic and contemporary settings.

ISS TRANSITION WITH THE END OF THE COLD WAR

ISS at Fletcher spanned the last generations of the Cold War (1971-1991) and has now extended well into the second post-Cold War generation.

With the end of the Cold War came a greater emphasis in course offerings on topics such as problems of proliferation, non-state armed groups, internal conflict and weak states, intelligence policy and operations, homeland security, and cyber war. When the post-Cold War era was punctuated by the 9/11 attacks in 2001, as when the Cold War had ended a decade earlier, ISS was well positioned to adapt to the rapidly changing global security setting.

The end of the Cold War brought new curricular challenges. If the Cold War had catapulted security studies to the forefront, would its end have the reverse effect? In retrospect, our conception of ISS in its first twenty years (1971-1991) eased the task of adapting to a quickly and dramatically transformed world. Looking back at the evolution of Fletcher's course offerings, together with conference and research topics, what stands out is how they, like Clausewitz's characterization of conflict and war, transcended the Cold War setting in which they originated and became relevant to the post-Cold War security studies field. In the mid-1980s, for example, ISS received funding for an oral history project⁴ that enabled faculty members to conduct interviews with former civilian decision-makers, military leaders, and intelligence operatives from the USSR and Warsaw Pact states. The interviews provided information about the growing coordination between state sponsors, terrorists and international drug trafficking, and it became clear that drug trafficking provided open channels through which terrorists could smuggle explosives and weaponry. This was an insight well in advance of the early twenty-first-century security landscape.

While ISS continued to address the enduring political-military dimension of international anarchy, the end of the Cold War brought fundamentally important contextual changes. In 1991, the Fletcher ISS, in cooperation with Columbia University's International Security Policy Program, engaged in an extensive curriculum review. Members of Fletcher's ISS faculty reached out to the broader international security studies academic community to understand the emerging paradigm and the role of military power in this new setting. Their efforts resulted in two volumes, published in 1993 and 1997.⁵ Based on papers and research sponsored by the National Strategy Information Center, which has done much over the years to enrich security studies, these volumes were the product of seminars that included some thirty directors and senior scholars from over twenty programs in international relations and national security. These volumes provided not only in-depth analyses of the post-Cold War security landscape, but also proposed courses and syllabi and provided an extensive discussion of both substance and pedagogy. What newer topics should be

the focus of the post-Cold War security studies curriculum? How should such courses be taught?

Taken together, these volumes were designed to “help instructors or curriculum planners to develop and revise courses that take into account the dynamics of the post-Cold War security environment.”⁶ The goals were to address traditional subjects in a new way, to introduce new subjects into the field, and to discuss appropriate post-Cold War approaches to security studies. Among the specialists who addressed post-Cold War security studies, there was agreement, already reflected in ISS at Fletcher but subsequently further reinforced, that security studies should embody national, international, global, and regional perspectives. The many topics

There was a recognition that twenty-first century students would need to understand more fully the impact of culture, values, and technology on military power and to rethink deterrence in light of the emergence of new transstate actors and the proliferation of capabilities to states and actors other than states, including sub-state groups.

addressed in the conferences and the resulting volumes included transstate security; nontraditional, non-combat uses of military force (operations other than war); economics and national security; regional security systems; and proliferation. There was a recognition that twenty-first century students would need to understand more fully the impact of culture, values, and technology on military power and to rethink deterrence in light of the emergence of new transstate actors and the proliferation of capabilities to states and actors other than states, including sub-state groups. The future global arena for armed conflict would not only span a broad spectrum from higher to lower intensity, but also a

wider cultural context with an unprecedented global diversity of actors. In the early-2000s, the impact of such forces became starkly apparent with the emergence of terrorist and proliferation challenges.

These volumes, assessing post-Cold War security studies and projecting identified trends and issues well into a twenty-first-century future, further helped to frame the ISS field at Fletcher. ISS both contributed to and benefited from these volumes, as the curriculum adapted both to include and anticipate a rapidly changing security setting during and after the 1990s. Armed with this perspective, ISS addressed a broad range of security issues stemming from, but also transcending, the international

context of the day, be it the Cold War or the twenty-first-century political-military setting. Fletcher made a major effort to reflect these issues both in the classroom and in extracurricular programmatic activities.

With respect to course offerings, this included major revisions in such standard existing courses such as *The Role of Force in International Politics*; *Proliferation, Counter-proliferation and Homeland Security*; *Internal Conflicts and War*; *Intelligence and National Security*; *Crisis Management and Complex Emergencies*; *Foundations of Policy Analysis*; and *Decision Making and Public Policy*. However, the post-Cold War and post-9/11 period also resulted in the addition of several new courses to the ISS field, including *Peace Operations*; *The Evolution of Grand Strategy*; *Modern Terrorism and Counterterrorism*; *Civil-Military Relations in Post-Conflict Environments*; *Leadership in Public and Private Sector Organizations*; *The Strategic Dimensions of China's Rise*; and *National Security Decision Making*.

Although several M.A. and MALD theses and Ph.D. dissertations had a security studies focus before 1971, the creation of the ISS field and program provided a major catalyst to such research. Consistently one of the three largest fields at Fletcher, ISS has always accounted for a major portion of M.A. and MALD theses, as well as the largest number of Ph.D. dissertations. Since the fall of 2002, thirty-seven percent of the 138 doctorates Fletcher has awarded have been from ISS, accounting for the largest number completed in any field at Fletcher. By 2013, the total number of Ph.D. dissertations on security studies exceeded 185. During the Cold War years, there were not only a large number of dissertations on U.S.-Soviet-related topics, as was to be expected, but also on such topics as transnational terrorism, the implications of a multinuclear world, nonviolent resistance movements, counterinsurgency strategy, and crisis decision-making.

With the end of the Cold War, counterintuitively, interest in the ISS field at Fletcher grew rather than diminished, and the number of Ph.D. dissertations in ISS rose. In keeping with this trend, ISS PhD dissertations totaled seventy-three between 1971 and 1991. In the subsequent post-Cold War period, a total of 112 more have been completed, as of the spring of 2013. A few examples of the many topics examined include WMD proliferation, counterterrorism strategy and policy, humanitarian interventions, the management of non-traditional crises, strategic information warfare, cyber space, rethinking deterrence, special operations, and the changing dimensions of alliances and security cooperation. Taken together, these topics further underscore the fundamentally political character of war, which changes not in its nature, but in the means by which it is waged—again in keeping with Clausewitz's dictum about war.

Several ISS dissertations have been published as books, and Fletcher ISS Ph.D.s have taken prestigious academic appointments and leading think-tank positions. They have served at senior levels in government and the private sector, both in the United States and overseas, thus extending and reinforcing Fletcher's global network.

ISS PROGRAMMATIC ACTIVITIES

International Security Studies was conceived not only as a curricular field of study, but also as a program of extracurricular enrichment. This has meant the sponsorship of various outside activities, including conferences, a senior-level lecture series, simulations, and occasional field trips. These activities were as much a part of ISS at its inception as they are today. The underlying pedagogy is simple. As a professional school, we have an obligation to link the academic and policy worlds and to educate our students to think about security not only in its narrow academic and theoretical dimensions, but also in the real-world policy arena. To do this, it is necessary for Fletcher's ISS faculty and students to engage with both policymakers and those who implement policy. How better to do this than to bring into our midst leading members of the political-military security policy community for lectures and conferences, while sensitizing students as potential future policymakers to the constraints, dilemmas, and opportunities confronting policymakers—in other words, both to bring the real-world security community to us and to bring us into close contact with the civilian and military members of this community.

Thus, ISS was founded on the premise that our understanding of political-military security depends on a continuing dialogue between the civilian and professional military communities. ISS can contribute to this goal through a broad range of programmatic activities. Therefore, members of the U.S. military as well as those from overseas are welcomed into our classes as both degree students and military fellows. They bring rich and unique perspectives, expertise, and experience indispensable to security studies education. Many former students have become senior military leaders. The ability of military students and alumni to share their experience with a successor generation constitutes another benefit from an approach to security studies that includes both the academic and practitioner communities. ISS-sponsored conferences, lectures, and field trips have furnished other opportunities for civilian students to become acquainted with the professional military. ISS was envisaged as part of a vitally important civil-military relationship including not only U.S. students but also those from overseas.

A particularly unique part of this engagement between Fletcher's faculty and students and the military is the ISS Senior Military Fellows Program. During each academic year, the U.S. armed services send outstanding field grade officers to attend Fletcher in lieu of a war college. The Fellows take part in the various classroom and outside-the-classroom activities of the ISS program, and they offer essential practical insights to Fletcher students. During the course of their fellowship year, they also complete a research paper on contemporary defense issues.

These Senior Military Fellows are in addition to the military students who come to Fletcher as degree candidates in the M.A., MALD, and Ph.D. programs. Of the various groups that comprise the Fletcher student body, the military students are one of the largest elements. This reflects Fletcher's important contribution to the education of the future military leaders of the United States, together with the benefits to our civilian students of having military professionals enrolled in courses with them.

As part of its effort to bridge the academic and policy worlds and to bring together the civilian and military communities, ISS works closely with IFPA to co-sponsor conferences on a broad range of topics. Partnering with a military service or command, our goal has been to identify and discuss key current and emerging security issues. Over the years, the IFPA-Fletcher Conferences on National Security Strategy and Policy, now numbering forty, have attracted thousands of participants, as well as speakers drawn from U.S. and foreign civilian and military communities. Fletcher's goal is to provide a forum for dialogue that cuts across the bureaucratic and other barriers that often limit the opportunities for discussion within government and with the broader academic policy community. These meetings offer a venue for those who study international security to be brought up to date on the latest thinking within the military on key security issues. Equally important, these meetings give the co-sponsoring military service or command a unique opportunity to set forth new strategies and priorities in the emerging security setting and to receive candid and constructive feedback from the broader security studies community. Because the IFPA-Fletcher conferences bring together leaders from the civilian and military communities, as well as those in the rising middle ranks, they contribute to an enduring ISS goal: the development and generation of dialogue and discussion among current and future leaders.

Each conference has yielded a report summarizing presentations and synthesizing the discussions or a book containing chapters based on presentations. These books, briefings, and reports have also allowed for broader dissemination of the ideas presented at the conferences. IFPA-Fletcher

conferences have received extensive media coverage, including multiple showings on C-SPAN. On one occasion, conference attendees found themselves besieged by television cameras. In 1980, a conference on the topic of U.S. power projection coincided with the aborted Desert One mission that attempted unsuccessfully to rescue the U.S. hostages held in Iran after Iranian militants overran the U.S. embassy in Tehran. Conference speakers and other participants were interviewed for the network evening news as well as published reports about the conference in a vivid demonstration of the conference's timeliness.

The topics of IFPA-Fletcher conferences have reflected and dovetailed with the school's ISS curriculum. Each conference can be placed within broader categories of international security issues that are of continuing interest, including, for example, the role of information and constraints on its collection and dissemination (intelligence); the emerging physical environments for strategy and security (the land, sea, air, and space domains); the impact of new technologies on the types and conduct of warfare (war in the information age and the cyber domain); the growing interconnectedness between political-military security beyond and inside borders (homeland security); the emergence of new actors as perpetrators of conflict (ethno-religious conflict); and, the changing roles and missions of military forces in the new geostrategic setting (special operations forces, expeditionary forces, maritime operations, air power and ground forces). This listing demonstrates the general security phenomena that frame the ISS curriculum and provide the basis for specific conference topics.

Among other extracurricular ISS programmatic activities, Fletcher hosts crisis simulations for students. Such simulations are an excellent teaching and learning tool that has been widely used inside and outside the policy community. Within ISS at Fletcher, simulation was recognized at the outset as a vitally important pedagogical contribution to security studies, both for its potential to educate participants about the issue on which the scenario is based and for its ability to teach students about the process and dynamics of decision-making, negotiations, escalation, and de-escalation. On an annual basis, ISS conducts a crisis simulation—SIMULEX—the purposes of which are several-fold. Both as a part of the Fletcher Crisis Management seminar and also as an outside-the-classroom experience, SIMULEX is designed to give students the ability to experience the dilemmas, constraints, choices, and opportunities that actual decision-makers face. SIMULEX has always been based on a scenario that represents a projection of a real-world setting. During the Cold War, scenarios focused on the East-West relationship. In fact, SIMULEX famously had

the Berlin Wall coming down the weekend before the actual event on November 9, 1989. What seemed like a plausible but unlikely situation when SIMULEX was conducted the previous weekend would have been overtaken by other events if held the next week.

With the end of the Cold War, the focus of SIMULEX shifted to crises in Southeastern Europe, Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, and the East Asia-Western Pacific area, as well as conflicts that broke out in one region and then spread to other parts of the world. The goal in each exercise is to increase awareness of the multifaceted nature of crises, including political, military, economic, and legal issues, all of which must be addressed, along with the cultural and ideological issues that shape and sometimes distort perception, cognition, and judgment.

SIMULEX is conducted with the active participation of the official military gaming community, drawn from the war colleges and military service academies. Student participants benefit from the knowledge, expertise, and experience of outsiders, especially those from the professional military community, who augment the military presence of the Senior Military Fellows. Further, participation of the military gaming community provides the possibility for the results of SIMULEX to be made available to a broader community, including military members, civilian officials, and academics.

The goal in each exercise is to increase awareness of the multifaceted nature of crises, including political, military, economic, and legal issues, all of which must be addressed, along with the cultural and ideological issues that shape and sometimes distort perception, cognition, and judgment.

THE WAY FORWARD FOR THE ISS PROGRAM

Given its enduring substantive and conceptual focus, ISS has striven to equip students to understand how to think, rather than what to think, about a challenging and complex political-military security environment. Although its foundations are deeply rooted in theory and strategy, and the field's core characteristics are still the threat, use, and management of force, the immediate context is ever changing. Our task, whether we study security or the other fields offered through Fletcher's multidisciplinary curriculum, remains twofold: to understand a present and emerging setting with its quickening pace of change and, for this purpose, to draw upon the

rich theoretical and historical literature to help bridge the gap between the academic and policy worlds.

Even a cursory survey of the twenty-first-century global armed conflict landscape reveals the importance of understanding its implications. Although we usually speak of globalization in its economic dimension, today's world is shaped decisively by a spectrum of armed conflict. The distinction that may once have existed between the domestic and international settings has been obliterated by actors armed with capabilities and motivated to wage war. Both states and non-state actors, including even individuals, have been given a more level playing field in which to engage in

.....

Although we usually speak of globalization in its economic dimension, today's world is shaped decisively by a spectrum of armed conflict. The distinction that may once have existed between the domestic and international settings has been obliterated by actors armed with capabilities and motivated to wage war.

.....

the use of force to achieve their political objectives and, in doing so, to exploit the vulnerabilities of their opponents.

We have entered a complex and uncertain twenty-first-century security environment. Consider the following likely dimensions of that context. In the years ahead, new security challenges will result from various actors who will have access to ever more widely available capabilities that confer unprecedented lethality, accuracy, and range. This includes not only weapons operated by humans but also robotic systems, new generations of biological and chemical weapons, and more sophisticated cyber weapons in the hands of both states and non-state armed groups. Security

challenges will arise from a large number of weak states, armed groups, other super-empowered non-state actors and authoritarian regimes, who will employ a range of irregular capabilities and techniques. Additionally, as was seen throughout the post-Cold War years, empowered non-state actors will employ the non-violent but nonetheless coercive strategies and methods of civil resistance to challenge the authority and legitimacy of repressive regimes.

These and other complex challenges that characterize this uncertain twenty-first-century security landscape will necessitate constant interaction between the civilian and military communities and between the military and other components of national power to develop effective security strategy and policy. Such is the context in which the study of political-

military security can no more be ignored today than during the Cold War. In light of such factors and trends, the need for the study of security has never been greater, because of its direct effects on groups large and small—states and non-state armed groups—as well as potentially on each of us as individuals. *f*

ENDNOTES

- 1 “Application for Support to Establish a New Field of Graduate Specialization in International Security Affairs,” is submitted to the Scaife Family Charitable Trusts and the Carthage Foundation, February, 15, 1971, p. 1. Several foundations and grants have supported ISS at Fletcher since 1971. However, none has been of greater importance than the Sarah Scaife Foundation in its sustained support for ISS at Fletcher.
- 2 The initial ISS proposal, and other documents directly related to ISS were reviewed in the preparation of this article. The Digital Collection and Archives (DCA) housed in the Tisch Library Building represent a rich source of documentation, including proposals, correspondence, newspaper accounts, and other information about The Fletcher School and Tufts University in general. According to the DCA, it “supports the teaching and research mission of Tufts University by ensuring the enduring preservation and accessibility of valuable records and collections.” Special thanks are extended to Dr. Susanne Belovari at DCA for help in ensuring access to relevant materials.
- 3 Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 75.
- 4 Uri Raan’an, Ernst Halperin, Igor Lukes, Richard Shultz, and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., eds., *Hydra of Carnage: International Linkages of Terrorism and Low Intensity Operations* (Lexington, Ma.: D.C. Heath, 1985), material from p. 11, “National Security Decisions.” Other products of this effort included Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., and Jacquelyn K. Davis, *National Security Decisions: The Participants Speak* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1990).
- 5 Richard Shultz, Roy Godson, and Ted Greenwood (eds.), *Security Studies for the 1990s* (New York: Brassey’s (US), 1993). In particular, see Richard H. Shultz, Jr. “Introduction to International Security,” (pp. 43-80) and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., “Future Use of Military Power,” (pp. 171-208). Also, Richard H. Shultz, Jr., Roy Godson, and George Quester (eds.), *Security Studies for the 21st Century* (Washington/London: Brassey’s, 1997). In particular, see Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., “Nuclear Weapons: Doctrine, Proliferation, and Arms Control,” pp. 141-178. Although we mention our specific contributions because of the ISS Fletcher focus of this article, we would call attention to the other chapters as well.
- 6 Richard H. Shultz, Jr., Roy Godson, and George H. Quester (eds.), *Security Studies for the 21st Century* (Washington/London: Brassey’s, 1997), p. 11.