When Ash Carter became Secretary of Defense in 2015, he inherited the finest fighting force the world has ever known. Together with Chief of Staff Eric Rosenbach, they promptly set out to make it even better. By clarifying America’s strategic posture, diversifying talent, opening all positions to women, and thickening relations with Silicon Valley and other centers of innovation, Carter and Rosenbach left no stone unturned in their drive to optimize the U.S. military’s two critical ingredients: people and technology.

Their playbook is well-suited to guide a similar effort at the Belfer Center. As Director and Co-Director, Carter and Rosenbach have inherited from Graham Allison the world’s No. 1-ranked university think tank. They intend to build on that success by sustaining the Center’s core mission while widening its aperture; enhancing its unique ability to leverage science and technology to meet global challenges; and priming the next generation of leaders in both scholarship and policymaking.
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PLUS: DEFENDING DIGITAL DEMOCRACY  ■  DEFEATING ISIS  ■  NEW SENIOR FELLOWS
As Secretary of Defense from 2015 to 2017, I served a mission vital to global peace and prosperity. I met often with foreign leaders, generals, senators, and CEOs. And because the military’s excellence depended largely on selfless people and unrivalled technology, I prioritized diversifying our pool of talent and deepening our sources of innovation.

Today, I’ve moved from the Potomac to the Charles, but my cause continues. As Director of the Belfer Center, I serve an organization committed to a more secure, peaceful world. We regularly host top figures in business, government, the military, and academia. And together with Co-Director Eric Rosenbach, we aim to diversify our scholarship and deepen our ties with leaders in science and technology.

This fall reminded me of the Center’s unmatched convening power. During just two weeks in October, we hosted four former Cabinet officers (Jeh Johnson, Ernest Moniz, Samantha Power, and Penny Pritzker), two U.S. Senators (Lindsey Graham and Mark Warner), and a former Israeli Prime Minister (Ehud Barak). Underscoring our ambition to train future leaders and advance policy-relevant knowledge, these decision-makers came not just to speak, but also to listen and learn from our students and scholars.

Eric and I are convinced that the intersection of science and technology and global affairs will define the 21st century.

We did not become an indispensable resource for public policy solutions or the world’s No. 1-ranked university think tank by accident. Graham Allison, who is still actively teaching and writing, deserves our enduring gratitude for his extraordinary vision and tireless work.

The energy, service mentality, and curiosity of our students is a major reason I returned to Harvard. I remain indebted to some of this school’s intellectual giants who mentored and inspired me decades ago—and I intend to pay it forward.

Eric and I are convinced that the intersection of science and technology and global affairs will define the 21st century. That nexus will guide my own research in the years ahead, beginning with an effort to leverage the forces of disruption on behalf of jobs and opportunity for all Americans, and helping to build out our important work on China and cybersecurity.

When Henry Lee and John Holdren bring students to Iceland to learn firsthand about climate risks in the Arctic; when Calestous Juma helps African farmers feed a hungry continent; when Nick Burns distills diplomatic wisdom from legendary Secretaries of State; or when Meghan O’Sullivan uncovers the impact of America’s energy windfall, the world sees our devotion to advancing research, ideas, and leadership.

The commitment of our supporters, experience of our scholars, range of issues, depth of insight, and collaboration with MIT and sister centers across Harvard make the Belfer Center special. We’re not just a collection of scholars, students, and staff; we’re a community that embodies both greatness and goodness. Eric and I are so pleased to come home—and to serve this center’s remarkable purpose.
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“This is the house that Graham built,” Carter said. “It would be impossible to overstate his contributions to the Kennedy School and the Belfer Center, and to the cause of a safer world.”

Carter personifies the Center’s convergence of liberal arts and hard science. While he earned his doctorate in theoretical physics as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, he also studied medieval history at Yale. “Physics helps you understand how things work, and history helps you understand why things are the way they are,” he said. Carter’s new title—Belfer Professor of Technology and Global Affairs—reflects that intellectual coupling.

“Only the Belfer Center combines the insights of world-class scientists and technologists along with Harvard’s extraordinary convening power to cover global affairs with unmatched depth.”

—Eric Rosenbach

“From nuclear weapons to climate change, the Belfer Center has always distinguished itself by sounding the alarm about—and providing solutions for—some of the most consequential global security challenges of our time,” he said. “Now, to ensure the Center continues to help policymakers stay ahead of evolving threats, we will extend our distinctive approach to a fuller range of science and technology issues.”

Carter’s first report for the Center, A Lasting Defeat: The Campaign to Destroy ISIS, details his efforts to reorganize the Pentagon’s battle against ISIS, culminating in the destruction of ISIS strongholds in Mosul and Raqqah in recent months.

Going forward, Carter will continue to monitor global security, especially in North Korea, the Middle East, Russia, and China. But he will also draw on his extensive relationships with Silicon Valley, MIT, and start-ups around the world to identify ways to make the forces of innovation more inclusive, especially for workers whose jobs are threatened by disruptive technology. “There are thousands of engineers in Boston and Silicon Valley working on driverless cars today,” he noted. “But how many are working on carless drivers—that is, the careers of those whose livelihoods will go away? Cohesion of our society depends on solutions to both.”

Rosenbach, too, brings firsthand experience to his new role. After serving as Assistant Secretary of Defense, where he was the Pentagon’s “cyber czar,” he is acutely aware of how America’s adversaries are working to undermine confidence in our democratic way of life through cyberattacks and information operations. To better defend the integrity of U.S. elections and related critical infrastructure, Rosenbach has launched a bipartisan project called Defending Digital Democracy. Featuring the campaign managers from Mitt Romney’s and Hillary Clinton’s presidential campaigns, along with technology and IT executives from Facebook, Google, and leading cybersecurity firms, D3P aims to equip election and campaign officials across America with practical tools to keep bad actors at bay.

“Thousands of think tanks cover national security and foreign policy,” Rosenbach said. “But only the Belfer Center combines the insights of world-class scientists and technologists along with Harvard’s extraordinary convening power to cover global affairs with unmatched depth.”

In recent months, the Center has welcomed a number of researchers from foreign nations, along with a remarkable group of new scholars, practitioners, and senior fellows, including Heather Adkins, Laura Holgate, Caroline Kennedy, Lisa Monaco, Deborah Plunkett, Samantha Power, Susan Rice, Liz Sherwood-Randall, and Suzanne Spaulding.

After seven decades underwriting security and prosperity around the world, the U.S.-led international order is showing signs of age and decay. Doctrines and commitments once held as sacrosanct are now openly questioned. In this environment, geopolitics has returned as a prominent feature of global affairs. In particular, the Belfer Center is building intellectual arsenals to help U.S. policymakers better manage a rising China and an adversarial Russia. From the new website RussiaMatters.org to Graham Allison’s national bestseller, Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides’s Trap?, Center experts are working to give policymakers unvarnished assessments of these nations’ intentions and capabilities in order to shape a more peaceful future.

“The Belfer Center has always distinguished itself by sounding the alarm about—and providing solutions for—some of the most consequential global security challenges of our time.”

—Ash Carter
While the war of words between Donald Trump and Kim Jong Un has heightened tensions, both sides remain deterred from launching a large-scale conflict. But tensions are so high that small sparks, inadvertently lit, could escalate. The time has come to tamp down tensions and explore means to reduce the risk of blundering into war, from hotlines to arrangements to prevent and manage incidents at sea, in the air, or along the demilitarized zone.

Nicholas Burns
Director, Future of Diplomacy Project
“As the United States goes forward, we have to have a comprehensive strategy ourselves that includes deterrence, United Nations’ sanctions, and financial sanctions by the United States. We also have to find a way to negotiate. If you practice strategic deterrence and make it clear that we are stronger militarily, you have to combine that with a willingness to talk directly to the North Koreans to get a sense of what their ultimate goals are and if any kind of compromise is possible.”

Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall
Senior Fellow
“President Trump’s loose talk about using nuclear weapons undermines America’s global moral authority and could inadvertently escalate into a catastrophic war. To successfully address the North Korean challenge, we must fully align our diplomatic, economic and military efforts with our South Korean and Japanese allies and build broad international support for credible actions in response to Pyonyang’s accelerating nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities.”

Matthew Bunn
Professor of Practice
“While the war of words between Donald Trump and Kim Jong Un has heightened tensions, both sides remain deterred from launching a large-scale conflict. But tensions are so high that small sparks, inadvertently lit, could escalate. The time has come to tamp down tensions and explore means to reduce the risk of blundering into war, from hotlines to arrangements to prevent and manage incidents at sea, in the air, or along the demilitarized zone.”

Ash Carter
Director, Belfer Center
“First, I would continue to recognize that deterrence and defense are essential. That means constant strengthening of our forces there. Second, there is a lot of talk about using diplomacy or military. The right approach mixes the two. Say to the North Koreans, ‘if you launch another long-range missile, here is what will happen. If you don’t, here is what the Chinese might do for you.’”

John Park
Director, Korea Working Group
“In the early years of Xi Jinping’s tenure as General-Secretary of the Communist Party of China, his signature anti-corruption campaign swept up “tigers and flies.” Some of these corrupt party officials were, directly or indirectly, involved in business deals with North Korean procurement agents embedded in the Chinese marketplace. With the codification of Xi’s anti-corruption apparatus following the 19th Party Congress, there is a real opportunity to significantly curb North Korea’s specialized procurement for building a nuclear inventory for credible minimum deterrence.”
(Also see Park’s testimony to the Senate Banking Committee, 9/7/17)

Gary Samore
Executive Director for Research
“Kim Jong Un is in the final stages of demonstrating that he can attack the U.S. with nuclear-armed missiles. At some point, he is likely to declare victory and dangle an offer to reduce tensions and limit nuclear and missile testing in exchange for sanctions relief and economic rewards. The Trump administration has done a good job of working with China to build economic pressure in response to North Korea’s testing campaign, but Washington has not yet prepared a diplomatic game plan to counter North Korea’s peace offensive.”
Iran
Insight and Thoughts on the Iran Nuclear Agreement

Graham Allison
*Douglas Dillon Professor of Government*
“For all its flaws, the [Iran] nuclear agreement is the one major hurdle preventing Iran from becoming a second North Korea…Trump should talk directly to those who have the most to lose: the leaders of Israel’s national security establishment...If he does, he will discover that a vast majority believe that pulling out of the agreement will endanger America’s greatest friend and ally in the Middle East.” *(WashPost 10/12/17)*

Payam Mohseni
*Director, Iran Project*
“President Trump’s decertification of the JCPOA and uncompromising offensive against Iran undermines U.S. interests on multiple fronts: 1) it tarnishes U.S. international credibility and fragments U.S. allies on Iran; 2) it lends popular credence to Iran’s hardliners on American ill-intent and untrustworthiness within Iran; and 3) it negatively shapes Iranian elite decision-making on the nuclear program and future compromise with the West.”

Laura Holgate
*Senior Fellow*
“Unlike imaginary [claims of] Iranian HEU or imaginary U.S. laws, the risks of an Iranian nuclear program unconstrained by the limits and inspections agreed in the JCPOA are all too real. Let’s keep the focus where it matters: making sure Iran continues to comply fully with its JCPOA commitments.” *(Arms Control Wk, 10/22/17)*

Jon Wolfsthal
*Associate, Managing the Atom*
“President Trump’s actions risk unleashing a nuclear crisis when and where we can least afford one. And to no good end, since the JCPOA is working. Efforts to build on it would be welcome, but Trump’s approach will both increase the danger in the region and divide us from our closest allies.”

Gary Samore
*Executive Director for Research*
“Obviously, President Trump’s bid to renegotiate the Iran nuclear deal is doomed to fail. Iran is not going to accept tougher restrictions while we offer nothing in return. None of the other parties to the agreement support renegotiation. When it becomes clear that a better deal is not possible, Trump will face an unsavory choice: unilaterally re-impose U.S. sanctions, which would be foolish and self-defeating, or back down, which will damage his credibility.”

Ariane Tabatabai
*Postdoctoral Fellow, Int’l Security Program*
“President Trump’s decision not to recertify the nuclear deal with Iran and kick the ball to Congress to decide its fate is the centerpiece of his emerging Iran policy, one that seems to be based on all sticks and no carrots. But with Iran active (and influential) in three critical theaters for the United States and its allies and the Persian Gulf, the United States must find a way to engage the Islamic Republic.”

Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall
*Senior Fellow*
“President Obama deliberately directed his negotiators to focus on the exigent threat: Iran’s proximity to nuclear ‘breakout’ which was estimated at just a few months in 2015. The JCPOA successfully reversed and now constrains Iran’s nuclear program and provides for intrusive verification. President Trump’s decision to decertify the agreement damages America’s credibility as a global leader and puts the onus on the U.S. for undermining a deal that has already significantly advanced international security.”

William Tobey
*Senior Fellow*
“The Iran nuclear deal is deeply flawed. Its duration is too short, and it fails to require of Tehran the universally agreed-upon minimum for effective verification—a complete and correct declaration of all relevant activities. Nonetheless, it would be a mistake for the United States to end it, primarily because Iran has already reaped most of its benefits from the deal while ours accrue over time, and because doing so would deepen a fissure with our allies.”

Payam Mohseni
*Director, Iran Project*
“President Trump’s decertification of the JCPOA and uncompromising offensive against Iran undermines U.S. interests on multiple fronts: 1) it tarnishes U.S. international credibility and fragments U.S. allies on Iran; 2) it lends popular credence to Iran’s hardliners on American ill-intent and untrustworthiness within Iran; and 3) it negatively shapes Iranian elite decision-making on the nuclear program and future compromise with the West.”
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“President Trump’s decision not to recertify the nuclear deal with Iran and kick the ball to Congress to decide its fate is the centerpiece of his emerging Iran policy, one that seems to be based on all sticks and no carrots. But with Iran active (and influential) in three critical theaters for the United States and its allies and the Persian Gulf, the United States must find a way to engage the Islamic Republic.”

Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall
*Senior Fellow*
“President Obama deliberately directed his negotiators to focus on the exigent threat: Iran’s proximity to nuclear ‘breakout’ which was estimated at just a few months in 2015. The JCPOA successfully reversed and now constrains Iran’s nuclear program and provides for intrusive verification. President Trump’s decision to decertify the agreement damages America’s credibility as a global leader and puts the onus on the U.S. for undermining a deal that has already significantly advanced international security.”

William Tobey
*Senior Fellow*
“The Iran nuclear deal is deeply flawed. Its duration is too short, and it fails to require of Tehran the universally agreed-upon minimum for effective verification—a complete and correct declaration of all relevant activities. Nonetheless, it would be a mistake for the United States to end it, primarily because Iran has already reaped most of its benefits from the deal while ours accrue over time, and because doing so would deepen a fissure with our allies.”
Lessons in Security & Defense

Women in Combat

At Harvard Kennedy School, Carter explains his historic decision to open all military positions to women.

On December 3, 2015, then Secretary of Defense Ash Carter made an announcement that would transform the U.S. military: all combat jobs in every branch of the military would be open to women.

“There will be no exceptions,” Carter said in his announcement. “As long as they qualify and meet the standards, women will now be able to contribute to our mission in ways they could not before. And even more importantly, our military will be better able to harness the skills and perspectives that talented women have to offer. They’ll be allowed to drive tanks, fire mortars, and lead infantry soldiers into combat. They’ll be able to serve as Army Rangers and Green Berets, Navy SEALs, Marine Corps infantry, Air Force parajumpers and everything else that was previously open only to men.”

“More importantly, our military will be better able to harness the skills and perspectives that talented women have to offer.”

At Harvard Kennedy School on September 6, Carter—now Director of the Belfer Center—talked about his decision during a Gender and Security seminar for students organized by Associate Professor of Public Policy Dara Kay Cohen.

In 2015, women had already been serving on the frontlines in the military for a number of years, but there were 220,000 combat positions for which women could not compete. “Because women are half our population in the U.S.,” Carter told the standing room-only crowd of students, “it was a practical necessity of force effectiveness that we reach the entire pool of our population.” In addition, he said, it was important for women already in the military to know that women were in no sense second-class citizens any longer, provided they meet the same standards as men.

Making and articulating the right decision based on compelling arguments was only part of his challenge, Carter said. “The other essential element was making it stick.” That meant “doing our homework very thoroughly—anticipating the questions and objections that people could have.”

He and the Pentagon’s leadership team conducted surveys of the force, looked at comparable organizations and other militaries around the world that had women in combat positions, and looked at SWAT teams and NASA flight crews with mixed gender compositions to see how they worked.

He also asked all of the services and components of the military to do their own analyses of how this decision would apply to them and to submit their findings to him along with their recommendations. “I read these very carefully,” Carter said, “because there are lots of different circumstances.” After carefully considering arguments and evidence from a wide range of stakeholders, he made the decision that there would be no exceptions.

It was important, Carter said, to make the announcement in a very deliberate and low-key way—and that it come from the Pentagon, not the White House, or from leaks to the press. “I wanted to make sure my reasoning and my argument was out there before anyone else had an opportunity to put another kind of argument out,” he said.

Carter’s strategy proved effective. Remarkably, after the announcement, he got no letters from members of Congress disagreeing with his decision.

Today, two years later, Carter said the transition has gone well, although some friction remains. Individual circumstances come up, he said, for instance in countries where women are not allowed to travel unescorted. “You work around cultural and other issues,” he said. “You have to do your best.”

Summing up his decision and the rigorous process that informed it, Carter directed some advice to the students and future leaders in the audience. “When you are trying to do something like this,” he said, “you must not only do the right thing, but also do it the right way.”

Seminar Series Focuses on Gender, Human Rights, and Security

This fall, Associate Professor of Public Policy Dara Kay Cohen launched the Gender and Security Seminar Series, bringing together leading experts from academia and the policy world to discuss their research at the intersection of gender, human rights, and security. The series is co-sponsored by four centers at Harvard Kennedy School—the Belfer Center, Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation, Carr Center for Human Rights, and Women and Public Policy Program.

In addition to the seminar with former Secretary of Defense Ash Carter, who discussed his rationale and strategy for opening up all U.S. military combat roles to women (see adjacent article), Cohen hosted Andreas Kotsadam, a senior researcher at Norway’s Frisch Centre who examines whether placement of women within a traditionally male-dominated environment can change gendered attitudes.

Kotsadam described research with the military in Norway, where female recruits were randomly assigned to some squads during boot camp. They found that living and working with women for eight weeks caused men to adopt more egalitarian attitudes. For example, for the men in the mixed groups, there was a 34 percent increase in thinking mixed-gender teams perform as well or better than same-gender teams. There was no evidence that integrating women hurt male recruits’ satisfaction with boot camp or plans to continue in the military.
A ruthless enemy spreading like cancer across the Middle East—and inspiring terror around the world. Regional allies and rebel forces too weak, too disorganized, or too timid to fight back. A Washington campaign lacking strategic clarity or urgency.

“These were just some of the daunting challenges America faced against ISIS when I became Secretary of Defense in 2015,” writes Belfer Center director Ash Carter in his new report, A Lasting Defeat: The Campaign to Destroy ISIS. “By that point, remnants of Al Qaeda in Iraq had coalesced under Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi to become as merciless as they were ambitious, brutally slaughtering innocents as they proclaimed a new caliphate that would stretch from Morocco and Spain to China and Sri Lanka.”

“Today,” Carter says, “Iraqi and coalition soldiers—backed by an American force the finest the world has ever known—have routed ISIS in two of its most important former strongholds: Raqqa and Mosul. How America, together with her friends and allies, turned the tide against a common enemy is a story of good fortune, critical leadership decisions, and skill and bravery on the part of young men and women in uniform.”

Read the full report at: belfercenter.org/LastingDefeat

Crafting “A Lasting Defeat”
Ash Carter Discusses the Campaign to Destroy ISIS

In his recent Center report, Ash Carter outlines several key lessons from this campaign:

**Good strategy depends on honest assessment.** The massive reorganization in the planning, execution, and communication about the counter-ISIS campaign was set in motion only after I uncovered the true state of existing efforts. This assessment included some painful conclusions about our chain of command and the lack of accurate intelligence about the enemy. Unifying our fight against ISIS under a single (exceptionally qualified) commander made a major difference.

**Lines of effort** are no substitute for strategy. Washington has developed a bad habit of stuffing bullet points under an alliterative title and calling it a strategy. ISIS was not going to be defeated by lines of effort. It would take concrete steps organized into a real battle plan—and it would begin by winning the approval of the president, local partners, and an international coalition.

**Metrics are motivating.** Even at the highest levels of government, officials often gravitate toward talking points and aspirations. Against a barbaric enemy like ISIS, what mattered most was results. So when we met with our coalition partners, we insisted on measuring their critical contributions in a chart that held everyone accountable. Meetings traditionally known as gab fests became enormously productive.

**Personal relationships** are essential. At the core of every tie between allies is a bond between friends. When making big asks, enlisting resources, or partnering on the battlefield, history and national interests are not enough. Getting Kurdish and Iraqi forces to set aside their long-standing animosity in the name of defeating ISIS was not easy. Neither was asking European partners to increase their role. But each came about because of hard-earned trust and the personal bonds of shared pain and shared purpose.

**No timetables.** The pressure to project and then report military milestones publicly is immense. But organizing a campaign around artificial deadlines isn’t just unrealistic—it is also counter-productive. In our case, moving prematurely, before local fighters had been properly trained and equipped, would have given ISIS the advantage. There are no do-overs in war. So we did it once, and we did it right.

**Victory must be built to last.** Could American forces have marched into Raqqa and Mosul in short order? Yes. Would that have accomplished our objective? No. Dealing ISIS a lasting defeat required a different battle plan—one that put local forces in the lead. This naturally took longer to execute, but through patient, persistent progress, we are defeating ISIS in a way that creates conditions for long-term security.
To mitigate climate change and its impacts, the Paris Agreement of 2015 offers participating countries the opportunity to cooperate with one another when implementing their national emission reduction targets.

The mechanisms designed to assist this process are intended to make it easier and less costly to achieve reduction targets. The cooperation mechanisms described in Article 6 of the Paris Agreement form the legal framework to allow use of market-based climate change mitigation mechanisms.

The Harvard Project on Climate Agreements has released a volume of 17 briefs summarizing research on options for implementing Article 6, the evolution of market-based systems, and how these two processes might best support each other. The briefs are designed for negotiators, policymakers, and other stakeholders as they consider how to carry out the Paris Agreement in order to realize its potential to effectively address global climate change.

To read the full briefs, see: www.belfercenter.org/climate

Arctic Initiative Focuses on Impacts of Rapid Climate Change

During his keynote address at the 2017 Arctic Circle Assembly in Reykjavik, Iceland on October 13, John P. Holdren announced the establishment of The Arctic Initiative: Science, Technology, Education, and Policy Innovation for a Sustainable Arctic at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center. The Arctic Initiative is a joint project of the Belfer Center’s Environment and Natural Resources Program (ENRP), headed by Henry Lee, and the Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program (STPP), co-directed by Holdren, who led the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and served as President Obama’s Science Advisor from January 2009 until January 2017.

The Arctic Initiative is focused on the environmental, economic, and social challenges linked to rapid climate change in the Arctic, with particular emphasis on issues for which insights about the relevant science and technology are germane.

Halla Hrund Logadóttir, ENRP Fellow and former Director of the Iceland School of Energy (ISE) at Reykjavík University, is a co-founder of the Initiative and will serve as program manager.

The Initiative will build on the experience and strong faculty and student interest at the Kennedy School and across Harvard—as well as strong relationships with many of the other organizations across the globe that work on Arctic issues—seeking to develop new insights and collaborations that link science, technology, and policy in support of responses to the challenges and the opportunities now facing the region.

“What is happening and will happen there affects not only the eight nations with territory in the Arctic, but the rest of the world as well. We hope that the new Harvard effort will be able to contribute meaningfully to the global efforts already under way to clarify and react appropriately to the changes going on there.”

—John P. Holdren

For more information about the Initiative, visit: belfercenter.org/Arctic-Initiative

Using Market Mechanisms to Advance Paris Agreement

Arctic Views: Harvard Kennedy School students and staff experience the northern lights in Iceland during their participation in the 2017 Arctic Circle Assembly in October.
In July, the Belfer Center launched a new, bipartisan initiative called the Defending Digital Democracy Project (D3P). Led by Belfer Center Co-Director Eric Rosenbach, along with the former campaign managers for Hillary Clinton and Mitt Romney, the project aims to identify and recommend strategies, tools, and technology to protect democratic processes and systems from cyber and information attacks.

By creating a unique and bipartisan team comprised of top-notch political operatives and leaders in the cyber and national security world, and working with experts from technology communities, including Facebook and Google, D3P is working to offer concrete solutions to an urgent problem.

Rosenbach, who was Chief of Staff to Secretary of Defense Ash Carter from 2015-2017, served as the Pentagon’s “cyber czar.”

For the D3P project, Rosenbach recruited Robby Mook, Hillary Clinton’s 2016 campaign manager, and Matt Rhoades, Mitt Romney’s 2012 campaign manager, as Senior Fellows and co-leaders of the initiative.

“Cyber attacks on campaigns and elections are a threat to our democracy and affect people of all political stripes.”

—Matt Rhoades

The Defending Digital Democracy Project is co-sponsored by two other Harvard Kennedy School entities—the Institute of Politics and the Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics, and Public Policy.

The Defending Digital Democracy team also includes Heather Adkins, Director of Information Security and Privacy for Google; Stuart Holliday, President and CEO of Meridian International Center and former U.S. Ambassador for Special Political Affairs at the United Nations; Nicco Mele, Director of the Kennedy School’s Shorenstein Center; Suzanne E. Spaulding, former Under Secretary of the National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD) at the Department of Homeland Security; and Alex Stamos, Chief Security Officer for Facebook.

“For the last two years, nearly every election on both sides of the Atlantic has been affected by foreign cyber attacks, including Hillary Clinton’s in 2016,” said Mook. “Cyber attacks on campaigns and elections, ” Rhoades added, “are a threat to our democracy and affect people of all political stripes.”

“Cyber attacks on campaigns and elections are a threat to our democracy and affect people of all political stripes.”

—Matt Rhoades

The Defending Digital Democracy Project will help campaign and election officials fortify themselves against attacks by:

• Developing solutions to share important threat information with technology providers, governments, and political organizations;

• Providing election administrators, election infrastructure providers, and campaign organizations with practical “playbooks” to improve their cybersecurity;

• Developing strategies for how the United States and other democracies can credibly deter hostile actors from engaging in cyber and information operations;

• Assessing emerging technologies, such as blockchain, that may improve the integrity of systems and processes vital to elections and democracy; and

• Convening civic, technology, and media leaders to develop best practices that can shield our public discourse from adversarial information operations.

For more information about the Defending Digital Democracy Project, visit: belfercenter.org/D3P
Monetary Policy: Christine Lagarde (right), Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, discusses global financial issues with Nicholas Burns, Goodman Family Professor of the Practice of Diplomacy and International Relations, during a JFK Jr. Forum in October.


Tech Talk: Yasmin Green, Director of Research and Development for Jigsaw, a unit within Alphabet Inc. that focuses on solving global security challenges through technology, speaks about the nexus between technology and geopolitics during a Belfer Center Director’s Seminar.

Policy Prescriptions: U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham speaks at a Belfer Center seminar during a discussion about the Iran nuclear agreement and other issues. Iran Project Director Payam Mohseni (left) and Harvard Kennedy School Dean Doug Elmendorf were among the discussion participants.

Confronting Nuclear Threats: Belfer Center Executive Director for Research Gary Samore speaks at the World Knowledge Summit in Seoul on October 17 about the North Korean nuclear threat.
At an Arctic Initiative seminar, **Fran Ulmer**, Chair of the U.S. Arctic Research Commission, discusses how a rapidly warming Arctic impacts environmental, economic, and climate systems on a global scale.

**Lessons from History:** Graham Allison (right), Douglas Dillon Professor and former Director of the Belfer Center, at a JFK Jr. Forum moderated by Kevin Rudd, former Prime Minister of Australia. The event focused on applying lessons from Thucydides and the Cuban Missile Crisis to current challenges with China.

**African Innovation:** The Belfer Center’s Calestous Juma (right), with Aggrey Ambali (left), Head of NEPAD’s Science, Technology and Innovation Hub, and panel Co-Chair Yaye Kène-Gassama Dia, at a Kennedy School reception hosted by Juma for the High-Level Panel on Emerging Technologies of the African Union.

**Senatorial Reflections:** U.S. Senator **Mark Warner** speaks to students and faculty at a lunch event co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Institute of Politics. He discussed a range of critical issues currently of concern to the Senate.

**Cabinet Conversation:** **Samantha Power** (right), Anna Lindh Professor of the Practice of Global Leadership and Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School and former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, makes a point during a JFK Jr. Forum in October on “Perspectives on National Security.” Moderated by MSNBC host Rachel Maddow (center), participants included (from left) Belfer Center Senior Fellow and former Secretary of Homeland Security **Jeh Johnson**, Belfer Center Director and former Secretary of Defense **Ash Carter**, Belfer Center Senior Fellow and former Secretary of Energy **Ernest J. Moniz**, and Power.
Q: As Secretary, you had to react quickly to things coming at you from all directions. Through this, how did you manage to keep a strategic focus on your priorities?

The nature of the job of Secretary of Homeland Security is one in which you are constantly on defense against threats that could come from multiple directions—land, air, sea, and in cyberspace. So much of the job is reactive. But I also realized that there was much to do to improve the workings of the Department and advance the President’s policy agenda. I defined a good day as one in which more than half the meetings on my calendar were meetings I initiated to advance the agenda.

First priority was to fill the numerous vacancies in senior-level positions in the Department. By 2013, the number of “actings” in those jobs, including my own, was pretty staggering. Working with the White House, we filled these senior-level positions within about nine months.

Second, we spent considerable time on management reform—simply reforming the way DHS did business and served the American people. The Department after 11 years was still too stove-piped. We raised morale across the Department.

To reflect the new threat environment, we prioritized countering violent extremism at home, and established an office for the purpose.

We also reshaped our immigration enforcement priorities to focus our deportations more on convicted criminals to improve public safety, and revised and improved the pay scale for our immigration enforcement personnel.

With Congress, we continued the capital campaign to rebuild the Coast Guard. We reinvested in personnel and technology for TSA after years of attrition in that agency.

Finally, we made a number of tangible improvements to our nation’s and the U.S. government’s cybersecurity. We got additional authorities from Congress to hire good cyber talent. We built automated information-sharing of cyber threat indicators with the private sector. We worked with Congress to pass the Cybersecurity Act of 2015. We deployed the EINSTEIN 3A system—which detects and blocks unwanted exfiltrations of data—across all civilian departments and agencies of the U.S. government. Just before leaving office I declared election infrastructure in this country to be “critical infrastructure,” something that will enable us to assist election officials to improve their own cybersecurity.

Q: The Department was formally established 15 years ago next month; what do you think should be its top priorities for the next 15 years?

DHS was formed in 2002 on the assumption then that terrorism was something that would infiltrate our homeland extraterritorially. So, Congress merged aviation security, border security, port security and maritime security and put it all in one Cabinet-level department under the purview of one Cabinet official who sees all the threats. Fifteen years later, I still think that’s a good structure and I wouldn’t change it. But the terrorist threat picture has evolved to include “terrorist-inspired” attacks by those who are homegrown or home-born. That’s why I think it’s so critical that we continue to focus our efforts, additionally, on ways to counter violent extremism at home. My fear is that the effort gets caught up in politics, and stalls.

As Secretary was to designate our electoral system as “critical infrastructure.” Moving forward, how worried are you about cyberattacks aimed at influencing our elections?

Very. Last year’s experience with the Russian government should be a wake-up call. It exposed certain vulnerabilities in state election officials’ cybersecurity, and I’m pleased to see recent news reports that states are taking actions to address this.

The Department was formally established 15 years ago next month; what do you think should be its top priorities for the next 15 years?

DHS must continue to promote cybersecurity as its other top-priority mission—something that was barely on the radar in 2002. I’d say in speeches that counterterrorism continues to be the cornerstone of DHS’s mission, but cybersecurity must be the other.

A building has more than one corner.

Q: As someone who’s seemingly done it all in your career—as a former prosecutor, private sector lawyer, and national security expert—what advice do you have for students interested in pursuing a career in the homeland or national security fields?

Public service is richly gratifying but not rewarding monetarily. So, avoid the golden handcuffs of the private sector.
For Debora Plunkett, joining forces with the Belfer Center’s Defending Digital Democracy project was much more than an academic opportunity—it was her duty as an American. Russian meddling in the 2016 election “hit at the core of me as an American,” she said. “I am offended that anyone would try to limit, distort, or alter the rights of Americans to vote, and so I’m interested in helping to develop and deliver security guidance that will help campaigns better understand and respond to current-day cyber threats and vulnerabilities.”

As the former Director of the National Security Agency’s Information Assurance Directorate and now principal of the cybersecurity consulting firm Plunkett Associates, she has seen firsthand just how aggressively America’s adversaries try to hack into our critical systems. As the leader of NSA’s cyber defense, cryptography, and information systems security missions, she directed thousands of personnel across NSA’s worldwide presence and managed a multi-million dollar budget. World-class technology, she explained, is necessary but insufficient.

From covert military operations to political campaigns, Plunkett said the common weak link in cybersecurity is people. Cyber attackers exploit people who prioritize convenience over security. There are several simple steps, she noted, that ordinary users of information systems can take to greatly decrease the likelihood of becoming a cyber victim.

“A common misunderstanding about cyber threats is that you need to be a big fish in order to be targeted by threat actors.”

“A common misunderstanding about cyber threats is that you need to be a big fish in order to be targeted by threat actors,” she said. “This is false! Fact is that malicious actors can and do use the resources (computers, networks, infrastructures) of unwitting and seemingly average citizens in order to gain access to more lucrative targets, or to build capacity that might enable broader control of networks. No one is safe and everyone needs to be thinking about securing their communications.”

Despite headlines about massive breaches of personal data at Target and Equifax, Plunkett is worried that Americans still prize inter-connectedness over security-consciousness. “Having an Internet-enabled car might sound great, but having the auto access point exploited such that you no longer have control of your speed, direction, or destination is no longer a pipe dream.”

Growing up in Baltimore with her parents and three sisters, Plunkett did not dream of becoming a cybersecurity expert. After developing a love for biology in high school, she earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Towson University, and then an MBA from Johns Hopkins University and a Master of Science in National Security Strategy from the National War College. As a newlywed in 1984, one of her first significant purchases was a then brand new Apple IIc, which featured a memory of 128KB RAM.

Plunkett’s journey through the NSA was by no means a straight path. She started out as a “crypto traffic analyst,” analyzing foreign communications externals in search of patterns that would reveal identities. “That was very satisfying work for me—I love a good crossword puzzle!” She continued to focus on what is now called metadata as she progressed into leadership roles. “My real break into cybersecurity came in 1999, when I was asked to represent NSA on the President’s Council on Y2K, and a follow-on assignment working cybersecurity policy in the Administration of President Clinton and then President Bush.”

“Having an Internet-enabled car might sound great, but having the auto access point exploited such that you no longer have control of your speed, direction, or destination is no longer a pipe dream.”

Among her many awards are the ranks of Meritorious Executive in the Senior Cryptologic Executive Service by President George W. Bush in 2007 and Distinguished Executive by President Barack Obama in 2012. In 2015, Plunkett was recognized with the Intelligence Community Equal Opportunity and Diversity Exemplary Leadership Award from the Director of National Intelligence and the Exceptional Civilian Service Award from the NSA Director.

When Plunkett’s not cracking codes or building firewalls, she’s often hunting for genealogical artifacts. “I enjoy trekking through cemeteries and going to state archives in search of clues and, when I’m really lucky, finding my family’s documents and photos,” she said. “I’ve had success in tracing one of my family lines to the 1830s, which is very exciting!”
WELCOME, NEW SENIOR FELLOWS

The Belfer Center is pleased to welcome the following high-ranking former officials and leaders who have joined the Center as Senior Fellows in the past few months. Each brings valuable expertise and experience in critical issues of concern to the Center that they share with students, faculty, and the larger community through their research, seminars, presentations, and various events.

The Senior Fellows below are listed in alphabetical order:

Dmitri Alperovitch
Co-Founder and CTO of CrowdStrike, Inc.
Dmitri Alperovitch is the Co-Founder and CTO of CrowdStrike Inc., a leading provider of next-generation endpoint security, threat intelligence and incident response services. He is a thought-leader on cybersecurity policies and state tradecraft and has served as special advisor to the Department of Defense. In 2016, Alperovitch revealed Russian intelligence agencies’ hacking of the Democratic National Committee (DNC).

As a Senior Fellow at the Belfer Center, Alperovitch is working with the Defending Digital Democracy Project to protect elections.

David S. Cohen
Former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency
David S. Cohen was the second-in-command at the CIA from 2015-2017. He handled foreign intelligence collection, all-source analysis, covert action, counterintelligence and liaison relationships, and assisted in managing the CIA’s domestic and worldwide operations. Cohen served previously as Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence in the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

As a Senior Fellow with the Belfer Center’s Intelligence Project, Cohen is conducting a study that focuses on the “CIA in the Digital Age,” looking into steps the agency can take to improve its capacity for anticipating and tackling intelligence challenges in our increasingly interconnected world.

Jeffrey DeLaurentis
Former Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy, Havana, Cuba
Jeffrey DeLaurentis is a career member of the U.S. Foreign Service, serving from 2014-17 as Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy in Havana, Cuba where he implemented the Obama administration’s diplomatic opening to the country. Earlier, DeLaurentis served as the Alternate Representative for Special Political Affairs at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations.

As Senior Diplomatic Fellow with the Belfer Center’s Future of Diplomacy Project, DeLaurentis shares his expertise with students and faculty, contributing to a deeper public understanding of diplomatic practice and U.S. foreign policy.

Salam Fayyad
Former Prime Minister, Palestinian Authority
Salam Fayyad is an economist and former Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority. His extensive experience includes serving as resident representative in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, as manager of the Arab Bank in Palestine, and as Minister of Finance of the Palestinian Authority. In 2007, he was appointed Prime Minister, a position he held until he stepped down in June 2013.

As a Senior Fellow with the Middle East Initiative, Fayyad delivers public and closed addresses, engages with Harvard Kennedy School students, faculty, and affiliates, and participates in events and activities.

Jeh Johnson
Former Secretary of Homeland Security
Jeh Johnson was Secretary of Homeland Security from 2013-2017. His responsibilities covered 22 areas, including counterterrorism, cybersecurity, aviation security, border security, port security, maritime security, protection of our national leaders, and response to natural disasters. Prior to becoming Secretary of Homeland Security, Johnson was General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

As a non-resident Senior Fellow with the Belfer Center’s Homeland Security Project, he engages with students, faculty, and fellows to explore the challenges of keeping America safe. He is a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, LLP.

Debora Plunkett
Former Director of the National Security Agency’s Information Assurance Directorate
As Director of the NSA’s cyber defense, cryptography, and information systems security missions from 2012-16, Plunkett enabled continuous innovation and development of strong security solutions and policies to protect classified government communications. She currently is Principal of Plunkett Associates LLC, a cybersecurity consulting business, and an Adjunct Professor in cybersecurity at the University of Maryland.

At the Belfer Center, she is assisting with the formation and implementation of the Defending Digital Democracy Project.
Robby Mook
Former Campaign Manager, Hillary Clinton presidential campaign 2016

Robby Mook is a nationally recognized campaign manager and strategist who ran the 2016 presidential campaign for Hillary Clinton. Earlier, he managed the successful 2013 election campaign for Virginia Governor Terry McAuliffe and the 2008 election of Jeanne Shaheen, New Hampshire’s first woman senator.

At the Belfer Center, he is co-leading—with Matt Rhoades—the bipartisan Defending Digital Democracy Project, which aims to identify and recommend strategies, tools, and technology to protect democratic processes and systems from cyber and information attacks.

Matt Rhoades
Former Campaign Manager, Mitt Romney presidential campaign 2012

Matt Rhoades is the founder of Definers Public Affairs and an accomplished political and public affairs professional. He served as campaign manager for the Romney-Ryan 2012 presidential campaign, guiding Romney through a crowded primary to the Republican nomination. Earlier, he served as research director for President George W. Bush’s 2004 reelection campaign and for the Republican National Committee.

At the Belfer Center, he is co-leading with Robby Mook the bipartisan Defending Digital Democracy Project to develop information and tools to protect the integrity of America’s elections.

Susan Rice
Former National Security Advisor and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations

Susan E. Rice served as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 2009 to 2013 and as National Security Advisor from 2013 to 2017. Earlier, she was U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. Rice’s many contributions include playing a critical role in containing the Ebola crisis, sanctioning Russia for violations in Ukraine, and achieving the agreement that prevented Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

As a non-resident Belfer Center Senior Fellow, Rice’s extensive knowledge and experience will contribute to an array of foreign policy and national security issues.

José Antonio Sabadell
Former Ambassador of the European Union to Mauritania

José Antonio Sabadell has been a Spanish diplomat since 1993. He served as the Ambassador and Head of the European Union Delegation to Mauritania from 2013-17 and previously as Deputy Director General for North Africa. Earlier, he served in a number of other capacities including as Deputy Head of Mission at the Embassy of Spain in Saudi Arabia.

As the Rafael del Piño-MAEC (Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation) Fellow with the Future of Diplomacy Project, Sabadell focuses on how radical Islamic groups use biased presentations of the West to attract followers and support their objectives.

Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall
Former Deputy Secretary of Energy

As Deputy Secretary of Energy from 2014-17, Sherwood-Randall was the Department’s Chief Operating Officer providing strategic direction in areas ranging from nuclear deterrence and science and energy to emergency response and grid security. Previously, she was Special Assistant to the President and White House Coordinator for Defense Policy, Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction, and Arms Control (2013-14). Earlier, she worked with then Assistant Secretary of Defense Carter on denuclearizing three former Soviet states following the collapse of the Soviet Union.

As a Belfer Center Senior Fellow who also served this fall as a Future of Diplomacy Fisher Family Fellow, Sherwood-Randall is researching the future of nuclear deterrence, energy security, and the intersection of national security and energy.

Gregory Treverton
Former Chair, National Intelligence Council

As Chair of the National Intelligence Council from 2014-17, Gregory Treverton provided both strategic intelligence and more immediate intelligence support to senior foreign policymakers in the U.S. government. Earlier, he directed RAND Corporation’s Center for Global Risk and Security and before that its Intelligence Policy Center. Earlier, as Vice Chair of the National Intelligence Council, he oversaw the writing of America’s National Intelligence Estimates.

As a Senior Fellow, Treverton shares his experience in government, intelligence, and security with students, fellows, and faculty.
Torrey Taussig
Democracy is Retreating, Authoritarianism is Rising

by Jacob Carozza

“History did not end after the Cold War,” says Torrey Taussig, a postdoctoral fellow in the International Security Program.

Many hoped a tidal wave of democracy would sweep the globe after the Soviet Union’s fall in 1991. But there are now indications of a global democratic recession, especially in the last ten years.

Taussig’s research focuses on the authoritarian regimes that have often filled that void. She recently earned a Ph.D at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, where her dissertation looked at the implications of authoritarian political and economic dynamics on Chinese and Russian foreign policy.

Like many in her generation, she says, the events of September 11—she was 13—opened her eyes to the fact that borders are “irrelevant to the movement of ideas, people, history, and cultures.”

But it was a book she read in high school—Secretary of State Madeleine Albright’s memoir The Mighty and the Almighty—that got her thinking about specific challenges to international security in the 21st century.

Taussig’s research found that in Russia and China, domestic political consolidation has been accompanied by more assertive foreign policies. Both nations are seeking to develop spheres of influence in their proximate regions and prompting questions about the return of great power competition.

“There’s a lot of uncertainty in what Chinese intentions are and what that means for regional stability,” she said, citing Syria as a prime example.

Authoritarian rule can also have unintended consequences for regional security, Taussig says, such as when regimes’ domestic repressive circumstances breed instability, generate refugees and lead to violent extremism.

“We’re more likely to see civil wars break out within those environments,” she said, citing Syria as a prime example.

Taussig says she next hopes to research how authoritarian states such as Russia are exploiting democratic discontent in the West and capitalizing on the same conditions, like economic insecurity and poor governance, that aided their own rise to power.
Elizabeth Philipp
Field Experience in Pursuit of a Richer Understanding

by Celia Carbone

Elizabeth Philipp’s passion for international relations sprouted at a young age. When learning to walk, she was also learning the French language from her Montessori school teachers. Global priorities have always been part of her life. During her college years at the University of Illinois, Philipp earned a double major in Global Studies and Psychology, a minor in French, and a certificate in Global Security. She also gained a deep interest in the Korean Peninsula as a result of a semester-long assignment on South Korea for her first international relations course. Philipp went on to apply for and receive a Fulbright grant that would take her to South Korea.

“If a researcher has a regional focus,” Philipp said, “it’s important to go to the region so that you have your own context and not just a second hand understanding of what the place is like.” The Fulbright grant allowed Philipp to move to Jeonju, South Korea, where—from 2013 to 2015—she taught conversational English at a local high school, tutored North Korean defectors in English, and led a conversational English group focused on international issues with young adults. Philipp’s experience in South Korea and her continuing interest in global affairs brought her to Harvard Kennedy School where she is a Master in Public Policy 2020 candidate and a Belfer Center International and Global Affairs Student Fellow. Last academic year, Philipp worked with the Center’s Project on Managing the Microbe where she co-authored a paper that is getting significant attention—North Korea’s Biological Weapons Program: The Known and Unknown.

“It’s important to go to the region so that you have your own context and not just a second hand understanding of what the place is like.”

Payam Ghalehdar
The Role of Emotions in Decision-making

by Jonathan Edel

Payam Ghalehdar grew up in Essen, Germany as the son of Iranian parents who fled the Islamic Revolution in 1979. As a child, he was privy to his parent’s nightly discussions on politics and the situation in their native Iran.

“At home, my parents would always have discussions about politics,” Ghalehdar said. “It was part of my life, sitting in the living room and listening to my parents and their friends talking politics all the time.”

Early exposure to political discussions and debates fueled Ghalehdar’s interest in international relations, especially with respect to U.S. foreign policy, but also the Middle East and Iran. His familiarity with the issues—along with his fluency in Farsi, German, and English—also gave him an edge when it came to academics.

Ghalehdar’s research focuses on a subject that has been especially relevant since the Arab Spring: U.S. pursuit of regime change. As a research fellow with the Belfer Center’s International Security Program, he is investigating the role of emotion in U.S. decisions to pursue regime change.

Based on his research on past U.S. interventions, Ghalehdar is finding that decisions to pursue an agenda of regime change are generally based less on the need to tackle a security threat than on the desire of a U.S. leader to discharge what Ghalehdar has coined “emotional frustration.” This frustration is based on a perceived obstruction or anti-American views by a regime’s leadership.

Hence, Ghalehdar argues, the common rhetoric about neutralizing threats and liberating the populace is often not the true motive behind the intervention, but more accurately a rationalization after a decision is already made. Ghalehdar’s research includes a number of case studies, including on the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq.

“When leaders or U.S. presidents are emotionally frustrated, regime change becomes a very attractive foreign policy instrument for them to relieve that frustration.”
By Kevin Rudd, Senior Fellow
Macmillan Australia (October 2017)

In 2007, Kevin Rudd became only the third Labor prime minister since the Second World War, after Whitlam and Hawke, to win government from opposition. In doing so he also defeated, and unseated, John Howard, the longest-serving conservative prime minister since Menzies.

So who was the man behind the phenomenal success of the Kevin07 campaign? This Mandarin-speaking professional diplomat, committed Christian, and self-described policy wonk, who grew up as the son of a dairy farmer in rural Queensland to become the 26th prime minister of Australia?

This is the first time we hear from the man himself, in his own words, about what makes him tick. This is an optimistic book, written with passion, conviction and insight. It is the first in a two-volume autobiography.

“Kevin Rudd’s story is riveting, invariably intelligent, occasionally grandiose and frequently shrewd....”

—Robert Manne
The Sydney Morning Herald

The Cold War: A World History
By Odd Arne Westad, S. T. Lee Professor of U.S.-Asia Relations, Harvard University
Basic Books (August 2017)

The Cold War offers a new perspective on a century when great power rivalry and ideological battle transformed every corner of the globe. The Cold War may have begun on the perimeters of Europe, but it had its deepest reverberations in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, where nearly every community had to choose sides. And these choices continue to define economies and regimes across the world.

Stunning in its breadth and revelatory in its perspective, this book expands our understanding of the Cold War both geographically and chronologically and offers an engaging new history of how today’s world was created.

“...[A]by synthesizes contemporary scholarship to produce an accessible narrative that provides a fresh perspective on the conflict’s pervasive global influence.”

—Publishers Weekly

Windfall: How the New Energy Abundance Upends Global Politics and Strengthens America’s Power
By Meghan L. O’Sullivan, Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of the Practice of International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School
Simon & Schuster (September 2017)

Windfall is the boldest profile of the world’s energy resources since Daniel Yergin’s The Quest. Meghan L. O’Sullivan reveals how fears of energy scarcity have given way to the reality of energy abundance. This abundance is transforming the geo-political order and boosting American power.

This book describes how new energy realities have profoundly affected the world of international relations and security. New technologies led to oversupplied oil markets and an emerging natural gas glut. This did more than drive down prices. It changed the structure of markets and altered the way many countries wield power and influence.

“A lucid and provocative look at the geopolitics of energy and the shifts and dislocations it is likely to produce.”

—Kirkus Review

International Security in the 21st Century: Germany’s International Responsibility
Edited by James D. Bindenagel, Matthias Herdegen, and Karl Kaiser, Senior Associate, Transatlantic Relations Initiative, Future of Diplomacy Project
Contemporary Issues in International Security and Strategic Studies
Bonn University Press (July 2017)

Failing states, conflicts over distribution, terrorism, and the refugee crisis represent only some of the challenges facing scholars and political leaders today.

In this book, acclaimed experts from Germany and abroad offer a panorama of the international security threats of the 21st century. With a particular focus on the role of Germany, these experts present strategic approaches through which these challenges can be tackled in the most effective and sensible way, thus providing new impulses for the security policy debate in Germany.

For more on Belfer Center books, see: belfercenter.org/books
HOLDREN WINS DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN PRIZE

John P. Holdren, Co-Director of the Belfer Center’s Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program, and former Science Advisor to President Obama and Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (2009-2017), has been awarded the 2018 Daniel Patrick Moynihan Prize. The prestigious award is presented annually by The American Academy of Political and Social Science (AAPSS) to “a leading policy-maker, social scientist, or public intellectual whose career demonstrates the value of using social science evidence to improve the human condition.”

STAVINS RECOGNIZED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Robert N. Stavins, Director of the Harvard Project on Climate Agreements, has received the Edmund G. “Pat” Brown Award, presented annually by the California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance (CCEEB) to a leader in advancing environmental policy in California and globally. CCEEB is a coalition of business, labor, and public leaders seeking to promote both a sound economy and a healthy environment. The award is named after the former California Governor, founding CCEEB Chairman, and father of current Governor Jerry Brown.

MIRONOVA: RESEARCH AND REPORTING FROM THE FRONT

Vera Mironova, research fellow with the International Security Program, who was embedded for a year (until mid-July) with the Iraqi Special Forces in Mosul, has been featured in a number of publications regarding her high-risk research from the frontlines of the war with ISIS. Her research includes interviewing fighters, ethnographic work, and collecting ISIS documents. Her work has been published in outlets such as Foreign Affairs, The Washington Post, and as a feature in The New Scientist (“Anatomy of Terror: What Makes Normal People Become Extremists,” August 16, 2017).

NYE AND ALLISON CONCEPTS SHAPE CHINESE POLITICS

The term “soft power,” coined a number of years ago by Harvard Distinguished Service Professor Joseph S. Nye, has been incorporated into the revised constitution of the Communist Party of China (CPC). In its October meeting, the National Congress of CPC agreed to add the Central Committee’s “new ideas” to the constitution, including to “enhance our country’s cultural soft power.” Graham Allison’s concept of Thucydides’s Trap has also gained attention in China, where Xi Jinping has referenced it in relation to the future of U.S.-China relations.

International Security

International Security is America’s leading journal of security affairs. The International Security journal is edited at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center and published quarterly by the MIT Press. Questions may be directed to IS@harvard.edu.
Remembering

John White

John White was my dear friend and close colleague for many years. I first got to know him well during the late 1990s.

My friendship with John began at the Kennedy School when he was Director of the Center for Business and Government (now the Mossavar-Rahmani Center). John was a major architect of bipartisan approaches to the federal budget woes of the time, which are sadly not that different from today’s. His ideas were widely hailed.

John and I grew closer when we both served in the Defense Department during the Clinton administration. He was Deputy Secretary of Defense to both Secretaries Bill Perry and Bill Cohen. One of his many accomplishments at the Pentagon during that period was to make the All-Volunteer Force, which replaced the draft, a success. I learned a great deal from the managerial skill and dedication to the troops John showed. He was also an example of civility and good comportment of the kind so often missing in today’s Washington.

But we worked most closely while at Harvard from 1998 to 2008. I had the privilege to teach with John. He was attentive and generous with his time and the students loved him. You could see how much he meant to them when he and his wife Betty hosted them in their Back Bay home.

“The he was attentive and generous with his time and the students loved him.”

The students showed their deep appreciation for John in 2004 by selecting him for the Manuel Carballo Teaching Award—an award that recognizes a faculty member’s dedication to students, excellence in the professional field, and commitment to public service.

Dedication. Excellence. Commitment. Traits John embodied in every aspect of his life, but especially his professional career. His teaching legacy now includes a world populated with alumni who strive to make the world a safer place, all the while maintaining the professional standards and common decency to which he held himself accountable throughout his career.

Those of us at the Belfer Center have lost a close friend. The Kennedy School has lost one of its greats. The United States has lost a great defense leader. The world has lost a noble man who embodied all that is good and decent in public life.

The Belfer Center has a dual mission: (1) to provide leadership in advancing policy-relevant knowledge about the most important challenges of international security and other critical issues where science, technology, environmental policy, and international affairs intersect, and (2) to prepare future generations of leaders for these arenas. Subscribe to Belfer Center publications at belfercenter.org/subscribe

Follow us on our various social media channels: @BelferCenter