

**DSS 5320 – Future Warfare**  
**UTEP/National Security**  
**Studies Institute**

**July 2017**

**Instructor:**

Dr. Michael McGee

Tel: 310-663-1931

Email: [mbmcgee2@utep.edu](mailto:mbmcgee2@utep.edu)

Skype: michael.b.mcgee

**Course start:** 03 July 2017

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This online (7 week) course explores the development of warfare in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (*and beyond*), with a focus on the defense and security challenges facing the United States in the future. It examines pressing strategic issues facing strategists and decision-makers as they try to prepare for future military deployments. The course is conceptually driven and puts an emphasis on the methodological challenges encountered when studying futures. Equal consideration is paid to technological and socio-political factors and their impact on future warfare. The course then moves on to the types, forms and dimensions of war in the future. The two last weeks seek to ground the debates and make them more policy-relevant via scenario building and defense planning.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

This is a graduate class in which students are expected to independently research the topics and to form their own opinion. The course uses a conceptual approach to the study of future warfare to enable students to think critically about it.

On completion of the course, students should be able to:

- Discuss critically some of the new trends in the application of force in international relations
- Analyze the role and limits of the use of force to counter future threats
- Outline the contours of the debate related to US military transformation and its consequences
- Evaluate the efficacy of emerging technologies and their impact on future warfare
- Assess the impact of socio-political factors on future warfare
- Demonstrate understanding of the various forms future warfare could take
- Critically assess the use of scenario to complement strategic thinking
- Discuss some of the key challenges of defense planning

## TEXTBOOKS & READINGS

There is **only one textbook** required for this course.

Colin S. Gray, *Another Bloody Century* London: Phoenix, 2005).

Students should purchase this book and read the relevant sections as assigned every week. Most of the weekly readings are based on this textbook together with additional articles from academic journals and other relevant sources. Some of the textbook chapters are not part of the weekly readings, but student are encouraged to read the whole book. Additional articles will be accessible via blackboard. If you have trouble accessing some journal articles, please contact the instructor. **Doing the readings is a requirement to pass this course.**

You can find cheap used copies of the textbook on [bookfinder.com](http://bookfinder.com), kindle and nookbook versions should be available online.

## ASSIGNMENTS

You will be assessed on a weekly basis and will receive feedback online. Here is an outline of the main assignments for this course. More information on the assignments will be provided each week.

- **Instructor questions** will test your understanding of the weekly readings. These questions will typically require short and concise answers (a handful of sentences), or brief definitions. You will not get extra credit for lengthy answers. Your answers to these questions will only be visible to the instructor who will grade them each week. You are expected to reply to these instructor questions **by the end of Thursday each week.**
- **Discussion questions** will test your understanding of the key concepts and your ability to discuss them coherently and convincingly. These questions will tend to be more open-ended, and aim to generate debates between the students. Your answers to these questions will be visible to all. These questions will require a bit longer, and a bit more structured answers but never more than 450 words). You are expected to reply to these instructor questions **by noon on Friday each week.**
- **Weekly comments:** Students must also post a minimum of two comments weekly. These comments should be related to other students' answers to the discussion questions and preferably be informative and constructive. You are encouraged to question assumption or related issues and make pertinent comments that may encourage further discussion or debate. Each comment will be worth up to 5 points and should be roughly 75-100 words. You may, of course, make additional postings if you desire but only the first two will count.

**Weekly Assignment Grading Rubric (indicative)**

Low grade (below 80%)	Medium grade (80-90%)	High grade (90-100%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Responds partially to questions or not at all</li> <li>▪ Grammatical or spelling errors detract heavily</li> <li>▪ Postings don't reflect other readings at all or inadequately</li> <li>▪ Does not present ideas clearly</li> <li>▪ Facts are incorrect</li> <li>▪ Readings were poorly understood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Responds adequately to questions asked</li> <li>▪ Some grammar or spelling errors</li> <li>▪ Postings tie in other readings to support answer</li> <li>▪ Presents ideas adequately</li> <li>▪ Facts are correct but with minor errors</li> <li>▪ Satisfactory grasp of readings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Responds fully, concisely, and thoroughly to questions</li> <li>▪ Writing is free or almost free of errors</li> <li>▪ Postings incorporate other readings very well</li> <li>▪ Presents ideas clearly and persuasively</li> <li>▪ Facts are detailed and correct</li> <li>▪ Readings fully understood</li> </ul>

**Scenario review (Week 6)** Select one of the 7 scenarios developed by Krepinevich,

and summarize its most important aspects and assess its quality using your own criteria. Post your review on the discussion board (and attach a copy in .doc) **by the end of Thursday** and comment on two other papers by **the end of Sunday**. The scenario review should not be longer than 1000 words, excluding bibliography and bibliographical footnotes. The review must be of a suitable scholarly standard, with all quotations/citations **properly referenced**. Students should use the [Chicago referencing style](#). A full **bibliography** must also be included at the end of the scenario review listing all sources used in alphabetical order.

**Short analytical paper: “ Planning for the future” (Week 7)** : Write a briefing paper emphasizing the key capabilities the US military will need to successfully fulfill its missions in the long-term. Make sure to consider possible futures (and related threats, challenges, etc.). Your paper should focus on force planning and make good use of the weekly readings. Feel free to use more resources. Students are encourage to make use of the section on analytical reports in the [INSS writing guide](#). This is not an essay, but an analytical report. The briefing paper must be **no longer 2000 words of text** (excluding the bibliography). It must be typed, 1.5-spaced, 12 font, Arial or Times New Roman. It must be submitted either in .doc or in .pdf format. The paper must be of a suitable scholarly standard, with all quotations/citations **properly referenced**. Students should use the APA or [Chicago referencing style](#). A full **bibliography** must also be included at the end of the scenario review listing all sources used in alphabetical order. Email your paper to the Dr McGee by the last day of the course.

Students looking for help to find additional readings/sources in order to prepare for their assignments are welcome to contact the Dr McGee by his email.



**Late submissions** will be tolerated in exceptional cases. Without **an approved Extension**, essays that are submitted late will receive an automatic 10 percent reduction/per day in the grade, up to 4 days. Then the grade is zero.

<b>Specific Grading Criteria for the scenario review and the analytical paper</b>	
<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Extent to which criterion is met</i>
Argument	Stated in introduction? Clear? Convincing?
Analysis	Critical discussion/evaluation of facts? Conclusions logical?
Coherence	Line of argumentation? Contradictions? Terms used consistently?
Structure	Is the paper structured? Logical structure? Systematic approach?
Research	Enough relevant sources? Quality of sources? Primary sources?
Language and form	Grammar/punctuation? Page numbers? Paragraphs? Referencing? Bibliography? Respecting the word-count?

**NOTE: One of the primary ways I will communicate with you then as a class is via announcements. There will be many over the course providing guidance, pointing out issues, giving advice, noting changes/corrections to the syllabus, etc. So, be sure to check the announcements regularly. Also, I will use email to provide individual feedback; be sure to be checking your email routinely for emails concerning this course.**

### GRADES

<b>Grading Scale</b>		
<b>%</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Grade Point</b>
90 - 100	A	4.0
80 - 89	B	3.0
70 - 79	C	2.0
60 - 69	D	1.0
0 - 59	F	0

## **FURTHER SOURCES:**

### *Online resources:*

- [Danger Room](#)
- [Future Conflict](#)
- [IHS Jane's \(on campus\)](#)
- [War is Boring](#)

### *Academic books:*

Adams, Thomas K. (2008), *The Army after Next*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Alexander, John B. (2000), *Future War: Non-Lethal Weapons in 21<sup>st</sup> Century Warfare*, New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Altmann, Jürgen (2006), *Military Nanotechnology: Potential Applications and Preventive Arms Control*, London: Routledge.

Benbow, Tim (2004), *The Magic Bullet: Understanding the Revolution in Military Affairs*, London: Brassey's.

Caldicott, Helen & Craig Eisendrath (2007), *War in Heaven: The Arms Race in Outer Space*, New York: The New Press.

Cerassini, Marc (2002), *The Future of War: The Face of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Warfare*, New York, PA: Alpha Books.

Davis, Jim A. & Barry R. Schneider (eds.) (2008), *The Gathering Biological Warfare Storm*, Westport, CT: Praeger.

Davison, Neil (2009), *Non-Lethal Weapons*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Friedman, Norman (2009), *Network-Centric Warfare: How Navies Learned Fight Smarter Through Three World Wars*, Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.
- Hammes, Thomas (2006), *The Sling and the Stone: On War in the Twenty-First Century*, St. Paul: Zenith Press.
- Klein, John (2006), *Space Warfare: Strategy, principles and policy*, New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Knox, McGregor & Williamson Murray (2001), *The Dynamics of Military Revolution, 1300-2050*, Cambridge University Press.
- Moreno, Jonathan D. (2006), *Mind Wars: Brain Research and National Defense*, New York: Dana Press.
- O'Hanlon, Michael (2000), *Technological Change and the Future of Warfare*, New York: Brookings Institution Press.
- Singer, P.W. (2009), *Wired for War: The Robotics Revolution and Conflict in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, London: Penguin.
- Sloan, Elinor S. (2002), *The Revolution in Military Affairs*, Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.
- Sutherland, Benjamin (2011), *Modern Warfare, Intelligence and Deterrence*, London: Profile Books.
- Wheeler, Winslow T. & Korb, Lawrence J. (2009) *Military Reform*, Stanford: Stanford University Press

***Academic journals (indicative list)***

Armed Forces & Society  
 Comparative Strategy  
 Contemporary Security Policy  
 Critical Military Studies  
 Defence Studies  
 Defense and Security Analysis  
 Foreign Policy International  
 Security Journal of Defence  
 Studies Journal of Strategic  
 Studies Media, War &  
 Conflict Naval War College  
 Review Orbis  
 Parameters  
 Prism  
 RUSI Journal

SAIS Review of International Affairs  
Security Dialogue  
Security Journal  
Security Studies  
Small Wars & Insurgencies  
Strategic Analysis Strategic  
Comments Strategic  
Studies Quarterly Strategic  
Survey  
Studies in Conflict and Terrorism  
Survival  
War in History  
War & Society

### **Plagiarism and Academic Dishonesty Statement**

Cheating is unethical and not acceptable. Plagiarism is using information or original wording in a paper without giving credit to the source of that information or wording; it is also not acceptable. Do not submit work under your name that you did not do yourself. You may not submit work for this class that you did for another class. If you are found to be cheating or plagiarizing, you will be subject to disciplinary action, per UTEP catalog policy. Refer to: <http://www.utep.edu/dos/academic.htm> for further information.

### **Disabilities Statement**

I will make any reasonable accommodations for students with limitations due to disabilities. Please send me an email or call me before or after class in the first two weeks to discuss any special needs you might have. If you have a documented disability and require specific accommodations, you will need to contact the Center for Accommodations and Support Services (CASS) in the East Union Bldg., Room 106 within the first two weeks of classes. CASS can also be reaching in the following ways:

Web: <http://sa.utep.edu/cass/>

Phone: (915) 745- 5148 voice or TTY

Fax: (915) 747- 8712

Email: [cass@utep.edu](mailto:cass@utep.edu)