ISSN: 2719-0765
No. 2 (July) 2021

Department of National Defense
National Defense College of the Philippines
Academic Affairs Division

NDCP FACULTY PAPER

In Focus: Policy Analysis for National Security Studies

National Defense College of the Philippines (NDCP)
Gen. Arturo Enrile Avenue, Camp Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo
Quezon City, Philippines 1110
+63 (2) 8912 1412
info@ndcp.edu.ph

ISSN: 2719-0765
NDCP Faculty Paper, No. 2 (July) 2021

In Focus: Policy Analysis for National Security Studies

Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase

Abstract

This paper is composed of critical and comprehensive discussions on the importance of studying policy analysis and applying this correctly in the field of national security. This is driven by epistemic questions on why policy analysis should be the centerpiece of National Security Studies; what the nature of *national security policy analysis* is, compared with *normal public policy analysis*; how a nuanced understanding of these two fields of policy analysis helps examine decisions and options for national security; and, what appropriate methods of policy analysis can be used by security analysts in academic and policy circles. The insightful answers to these areas of inquiry aim to place *national security policy analysis* in proper focus and at the center of National Security Studies, especially in the National Defense College of the Philippines (NDCP).

About the author:

Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, DPA is a Professor III of the National Defense College of the Philippines (NDCP) and the Course Director of the National Security Policy Analysis Course in the Master in National Security Administration (MNSA) Program of NDCP. She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Journalism and Master's and Doctoral degrees in Public Administration, which are all from the University of the Philippines (UP) in Diliman, Quezon City. As part of her continuing professional education, she also took up the Advanced Security Cooperation Course at the Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies (APCSS) in Honolulu, Hawaii; and two Executive Education Courses on Mastering Negotiation, and on National and International Security for Senior Executives at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In an uncertain world where problems are more complex than before, figuring out possible solutions is never easy because the future is hard to see.[1] As I wrote in the beginning of my analysis of the Philippines' foreign policy gambit in 2020:

> Now more than ever, we live in a world that is uncontrollable and unpredictable. As it is in constant change, we grapple and gamble with the odds that lie ahead. But with theoretical frames, we try to make sense of complex relations in order to explain causations, especially in conflict situations. And with analytical tools, we strive to weigh in our policy choices so as to predict likely consequences, even with limited information.[2] (Underline provided.)

In a field of inquiry where value judgements are made about national security, the examination of the core properties of policy choices is critical to survival. Knowledge of why and how policy is determined matters a lot in changing a problematical state of affairs or in continuing a beneficial status quo. This is despite the fact that time and information, which are needed to make good policy, may not be sufficient; and that the strategic environment, which a course of action is directed at, cannot completely be controlled. Given these realities, we should have the intellectual discipline to make sense of complexity, trace multiple causalities, and anticipate possible outcomes of policy alternatives.

With theories and tools to analyze policy, we are able to understand the broader context within which certain actions or reactions have to be considered vis a vis their cost and effectiveness, among other value criteria. With best option and informed decision at hand, we can increase our chances of getting effective results and also of gaining control of the situation. All this is the purpose and function of a theory-based and empirically grounded *policy analysis.*

In the study of *Public Administration*[3], policy analysis is basically defined as a multi-disciplinary process of inquiry through which component parts of a policy problem are analyzed, policy options are evaluated, and a best course of action is recommended to resolve a problem and/or improve an existing policy.[4] Policy analysis informs policy-makers and administrators at national and/or local level(s) on what to do with public problems and how government resources will be used for public good and welfare. This, in essence, is what *public policy* is all about: whatever government decides to do or not to do about issues, problems, and opportunities in the societal environment.[5]

---

[1] That the future is hard to see when making decisions in national security arena was asserted by Richard L. Kugler in *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era* (Washington, DC, USA: Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University, 2006), pp. xv-xvi.

[2] Ananda Devi D. Almase, "Duterte's Gambit: How the Two-Level Game Theory Explains the Odds of Terminating the US Visiting Forces Agreement," *NDCP Faculty Paper* No. 1 (July 2020), p. 1. ISSN: 2719-0773. http://www.ndcp.edu.ph/TRANSPARENCY%20-%20PDF%20FILES/Faculty%20Paper/NDCP%20Faculty%20Paper%20(Online%20Copy)%2005022021%20v

[3] *Public Administration* (PA), which is capitalized, refers to the name of the academic field; *public administration*, which is in small letters, refers to the practice. The late Dr. Raul P. De Guzman, Professor Emeritus of the University of the Philippines (UP) and father of Philippine Public Administration, defined PA as a professional and scholarly discipline that is concerned about the formulation and implementation of public policies and programs, as well as the socio-cultural, economic, and political factors that bear on them. According to him, PA "deals with the systematic study of institutions and processes and the interplay of factors involved in authoritative decision-making on goals, in implementing them and in achieving desired results." [Raul P. De Guzman, "Is There a Philippine Public Administration?," in *Introduction to Public Administration: A Reader* ed. by Victoria A. Bautista et al. (Diliman, Quezon City: UP Press and UP College of Public Administration, 1993), p. 4.]

[4] For comprehensive definition and scope of policy analysis, see William N. Dunn, *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction* Fifth Edition (New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education Incorporated, 2012).

See also Carl V. Patton, David S. Sawicki & Jennifer E. Clark, *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning* Third Edition (New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education Incorporated, 2013).

[5] This classic definition of public policy can be sourced from the foundational readings authored by Friedrich and Mason in 1940 and Dye in 1976. [See C.J. Friedrich and Edward S. Mason, *Public Policy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA: The Harvard University Press, 1940); and Thomas R. Dye, *What Governments Do, why They Do It, and What Difference it Makes* (Alabama, USA: University of Alabama Press, 1976).]

An example of public policy that aims to address a socio-economic problem is the social amelioration program carried out by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) in the Philippines. This policy measure provides conditional cash grants to indigent families to improve their living conditions and enable their children to go to school.[6] The DSWD program is similar to the conditional cash transfer (CCT) scheme distributed to poorest families in Latin America and Africa. Another example of a public policy adopted by the Philippines, as well as by other countries, is the empowerment of women and promotion of gender equality through what is known as the gender and development (GAD) program. This policy approach with gender dimension is deemed critical to poverty alleviation, sustainable economic development, and good governance in the Philippines and in the region. Aside from distributive and development-oriented policy measures like the CCT and GAD, there are other types of public policies that are aimed at regulating procedures, penalizing lawbreakers, extracting revenues, resolving disputes, as well as organizing and administering government bureaucracy.

In *National Security Studies*[7], which is a sub-discipline of *International Relations*[8], policy analysis has the same logic as that in the praxis of public administration. The former, however, has different orientation and direction. *National security policy analysis* probes into issues and problems directly affecting the national interests. It also provides information and insights on making decisions for defense, security, and foreign policies. Some examples of policy questions are: whether the Philippines should terminate the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) with the United States (US); what course(s) of action should the Philippines take to address the security threat in the South China Sea (SCS); and, how should the Philippines engage with China to protect the Philippines' interests post SCS arbitration.

National security policy analysis helps the national leadership conduct foreign policy wisely and use instruments of national power [e.g., political diplomacy, military, trade and economy, and information and technology] effectively. It clarifies national security goals and/or identifies new direction to be pursued in relation to emerging threats and opportunities in the security environment. It gives estimates of costs and benefits of available options, weighs up comparative values of trade-offs and pay-offs, as well as alerts decision-makers to spoilers and red flags. National security policy analysis helps government minimize risks of failure by analyzing beforehand whether policy choices are wise or likely to succeed.[9]

Aside from the practical and political purposes of policy analysis, scholars also ask questions or research puzzles about policy cases to illumine key issues of policy debates and/or explain causal mechanisms in policy determination. Academics also look into contents of policies to deconstruct policy arguments and analyze their theoretical underpinnings.[10] Whether in public management, public safety

[6] This policy measure is known as "*Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program*" (4Ps), aimed at improving the health and education of children from the poorest families in the Philippines.

[7] *National Security Studies* is a specialized field of inquiry under *International Relations*. In some colleges in the US and United Kingdom (UK), National Security Studies is a separate graduate program that is especially designed for intelligence analysts, academic scholars, and future strategic leaders and diplomats in national security affairs. The course is about the theories and tools of understanding threats to national and international security, and of analyzing national security policies and/or strategies of concerned states.

[8] *International Relations* (IR), which is singular and spelled with initial capital letters, is an interdisciplinary study of the political dynamics and power relations between and among sovereign states, along with independent actors, in an international system with no governing system above them. The academic field of IR—which has a claim of equal status with other established courses in social sciences—is concerned about the international political economy and the traditional and non-traditional threats to national security, international order, and global commons. [For basic introduction to IR, see Karen A. Mingst and Ivan M. Arreguin-Toft, *Essentials of International Relations* 5th Edition (New York, USA: Norton, W.W. & Company, Inc., 2011). See also Charles Jones, *International Relations: A Beginner's Guide* (London, England: Oneworld Publications, 2014).]

[9] For comprehensive discussions on the purpose of policy analysis in national security domain, see Kugler, pp. 2, & 12-17.

[10] *Deconstruction* is as a method of critiquing language and semantics to unravel some conceptual instability and ambiguity in the substance and structure of a discourse, such as a policy argument. [Ananda Devi D. Almase, "Strategic Ambiguity: Deconstructing Duterte's 2018 National Security Strategy," *University of Nottingham Asia Dialogue*, 1 October 2018, https://theasiadialogue.com/2018/10/01/strategic-ambiguity-deconstructing-dutertes-2018-national-security-strategy/.]

governance, or national security administration, policy analysis sharpens our thought processes and decision-making skills. It enables us to think clearly and critically about the logic, rationality, suitability, feasibility, and/or acceptability of policy choices. But to come up with coherent analysis and argument, we must learn about the field in which we try to explain and resolve particular problems.

For example, when a journalist asks a policy question of whether to stop the 8 million dollar rehabilitation project of Manila Bay, due to allegedly harmful dolomite sand being dumbed there, he or she should have background on *public choice theory*,[11] local governance, and/or sustainable development from the study of Public Administration in order to come up with sound analysis and policy advocacy. When a critic questions the Philippines' pivot to China and soft stance on China's harassment in the West Philippine Sea, he or she should have orientation in International Relations, particularly National Security Studies, to be able to comprehend why weak states behave the way they do. And when an analyst explains the case of the Philippine drug war, he or she should have knowledge about *securitization theory*[12] and the politics of existential threat to argue for (or against) the difficult decision to take extraordinary measures beyond normal procedures.[13]

In all of the foregoing examples, educated perspectives are important to justify or judge the merits of policy choices. I do not mean to say that scholars and analysts from the same field of study always agree with each other; in fact, they also argue with their nuanced frames of analysis from different schools of thought. My point is that the quality of policy debates will not be compromised when analysts have appropriate theories or bases of knowledge to advance coherent arguments. This is precisely what a policy analysis is made up of in the academia, and the reason why professionals and practitioners pursue continuing education in policy-oriented fields of social sciences, such as National Security Studies.

With that in mind, I articulate three important questions as points for discussion: Why should policy analysis be the centerpiece of National Security Studies? What is the nature of *national security policy analysis* and how does this compare with *normal public policy analysis*? Lastly, how does a nuanced understanding of the two fields of policy analysis help examine decisions and options for national security? Simply put, what are the appropriate methods and guidelines for national security policy analysis, which can be used by researchers and analysts in academic and policy circles?

As a faculty of the National Defense College of the Philippines (NDCP), I endeavor to write a paper that will explain the nature and purpose of the subject in focus: policy analysis for National Security Studies. The intention is to place in proper perspective why policy analysis should be central to, rather than on the side of, discussions of national security concerns in this College. Learning best the theories and methods of our field is essential to good analysis and better policy. This is the key to develop and enrich the interdisciplinary studies of national security in NDCP.

---

[11] *Public choice theory* uses the economic approach [e.g., cost-benefit analysis and risk aversion] to explain decision-making processes in government. For comprehensive discussions of public choice, see Dennis C. Mueller, "Public Choice: An Introduction," *The Encyclopedia of Public Choice* Vol. 1 ed. by Charles K. Rowley and Friedrich Schneider (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004), pp. 32–48.

[12] Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde's *securitization theory* explains that securitization happens when a problem is presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedures. As the authors wrote: "Securitization can thus be seen as a more extreme version of politicization." [See Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework of Analysi*s (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc, 1998), p. 23.]

[13] See Ananda Devi D. Almase, "The Case of the Philippine Drug War: When the State Securitizes an Existential Threat to Public Safety," *University of Nottingham Asia Dialogue Dialogue*, 5 September 2017, https://theasiadialogue.com/2017/06/01/the-case-of-the-philippine-drug-war-when-the-state-securitizes-an-existential-threat-to-public-safety/.

Why Policy Analysis Should be the Centerpiece of National Security Studies

The discipline of analyzing national security policy is not just about the mastery of tools and techniques of problem-solving.[14] More importantly, it is also about the study of theories and ways of thinking about the subject of analysis, that is, what to do about a national security problem.[15] The thought process begins with broad and deep understanding of threats to national security of a state in relation to the international political system or to a regional security complex.[16]

The capacity to analyze the state of nature in this century is the starting point of coping with difficult challenges in the vulnerable, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) world that we live in. How we argue about security problems and come up with necessary countermeasures are the function of a theory-based policy analysis in National Security Studies. Since the latter delves into modes of intelligent discussions and normative prescriptions about national security, constructing powerful policy arguments (as well as deconstructing weak ones) is crucial. It is along this line that I will discuss important points as to why policy analysis should be front and center in National Security Studies, especially in a defense college like NDCP.

National security is a policy construct

I would like to begin by pointing out that national security is a loaded, two-word phrase. The logic of the grammatical structure is explicit: the adjective "national"[17] modifies the abstract noun "security."[18] This indicates a categorical description of security that is distinct from other kinds of security [e.g., social security, health security, economic security, and environmental security]. What then is "national

---

[14] As Kugler wrote in the preface of his 2006 book on *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era:* "This is not a recipe book for measuring and calculating or for otherwise employing techniques and procedures. Along the way, it covers these facets of policy analysis, but it is not mainly about them. Instead, it is a philosophical and conceptual book for helping people think deeply, clearly, and insightfully about complex policy issues. It is anchored in the premise that knowing how to think enhances the odds of reaching sound judgments. Thus, it is a thinking person's book because thinking is the wellspring of good policy analysis." (Underline provided.) [Kugler, p. xv.]

[15] Alan Stolberg, in his article on national security policy-making, wrote that policy can simply be defined as "what to do about something" or "what is to be done." His formal definition of policy is: "a course of action or guiding principle that provides guidelines, boundaries, and limitations intended to influence and determine decisions and actions, to include guidance for the development of an implementing strategy." [Allan G. Stolberg, "Making National Security Policy in the 21st Century," *US Army War College Guide to National Security Issues Volume II: National Security Policy and Strategy* ed. by J. Boone Bartholomees, Jr. (Pennsylvania, USA: US Army War College, 2012), p. 41.

[16] The *regional security complex theory* (RSCT) refers to patterns and intensities of geopolitics and security relations between and among units, usually the states, with common and/or conflicting security interests in their own region. Specifically, Buzan et al. defined *security complex* as "a set of units whose major processes of securitization, desecuritization, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another." [Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, pp. 42-43, 201.]

Buzan and Wæver explained RSCT as an emergent structure of international security. The RSCT frame of analysis enables scholars to analyse, explain, and anticipate (to a certain degree) strategic developments in any region. It provides a more nuanced view of the international political system instead of describing this as unipolar, bipolar, or multipolar. A substructure of the international system, regional security complex has "important mediating effects on how the global dynamics of great power polarity actually operate." The RSCT works along with realist and liberal theories since the formation and operation of regional security complex(es) are determined by patterns of amity and enmity among the system's units and also by their national security policies. [Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, "Security Complexes: A Theory of Regional Security," *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 40-82.]

[17] In Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde's framework of analysis, "security" is a generic term that means survival in the face of existential threats. However, what constitutes threat is not the same across different sectors: political, military, economic, societal, and environmental. [Buzan,Wæver and de Wilde, p. 27.]

[18] That national security is distinct from other kinds and levels of security is clear in the semantics of Caldwell and Williams when they wrote that security studies need "to go beyond national security" to include human security and cooperative security in this century. [Dan Caldwell and Robert E. Williams, Jr., *Seeking Security in an Insecure World* Third Edition (London, UK: Rowman and Littlefield, 2016), p. 258.]

security" and how is this oriented to policy? This is what we are concerned about in this section, that is, the modified meaning of security that has analytical purchase to policy researchers and professionals in national security affairs. In my lectures in NDCP, I introduced national security first as a concept, then as a subject of analysis, and lastly as a policy—around which National Security Studies should revolve.

As a concept, national security is socially constructed, culture-bound, threat-based, and even politically contested.[19] This means that the idea of national security is not universal to all societies in diverse regions of the world and in different periods of time. What makes a state secure or insecure is also not the same for nations, as well as scholars of National Security Studies. Realists equate national security with military power to deter aggression or, if deterrence fails, with superior armed forces to defend the state against armed attack. They put high premium to economic wealth in order for a country to be strong. Liberals, on the other hand, believe democracy, as well as cooperation, is the key to guarantee peace and development in national and international communities. For critical advocates, it is human security[20] [i.e., human rights] that can emancipate peoples from conflict and ensure them of quality living. But if impressions about national security are stretched to all things that can make people feel secure at their level, how are we to grapple with the loose concept of national security? This is a rhetorical question that is better addressed in this essay rather than merely articulated as a puzzle.

As scholars of International Relations (IR) will tell us, "national" in national security refers to the state or nation-state, as in the "national interest" and "national defense."[21] Here, security is defined at the level of the state that constitutes the international political system.[22] In National Security Studies, the classic definition of security pertains to the security of the state against military threat. This has always been the primordial concern of IR, an academic field borne out of the need to understand the causes of wars in the 20th century. For realist scholars, to think about national security is to study about war or threat of war. In this traditional notion of security, military force—as the means by which wars are waged or deterred—is thought about as the primary or the sole guarantor of national security.[23]

Stephen Walt, in his 1991 article on *The Renaissance of Security Studies*, defined this academic field as the study of the threat, use, and control of military force.[24] The American scholar argued that extending the security ambit to regular public problems [e.g., pollution, disease, child abuse, and economic recession] is problematic. This extended purview would destroy the intellectual coherence of the term, thus making it more difficult to come up with solutions to any of those public problems, according to Walt.[25] In response to this argument, Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde—in their 1998 book on *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*—spelled out the need to classify and clarify what is and what is not a security worthy issue. The British professors warned of "intellectual and political dangers" of "simply tacking the word *security* onto an ever wider range of issues," as this would have "undesirable

[19] In a 2013 article on what the subject of security really means in the Philippines, I wrote that the concept of national security is subject to perceptions, deliberations, and even tensions in the academe and the political realm. Competing values and interests make the subject naturally contestable in different nations and policy communities. That security is a "contested concept" was articulated by scholars with different theoretical perspectives and policy imperatives on how security is to be seen, satisfied, and strengthened. There are at least two different worldviews on the focus and scope of security: the *realist*, narrow focus on deterring the enemy and defending the state against external as well as internal threats; and the *constructivist*, wide frame of protecting and enhancing human lives in all dimensions. [Ananda Devi D. Almase, "What the Subject of Security Really Means: A Look into the Content and Context of the 2011-2016 National Security Policy Analysis in the Philippines," *National Security Review* (2013), pp. 84-85.]

[20] According to the 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), there are seven dimensions of human security: community security, health security, economic security, food security, political security, environmental security, and personal security. [See UNDP, H*uman Development Report 1994* (New York, USA: Oxford University Press, 1994).]

[21] Caldwell and Williams, pp. 17 & 184.

[22] Ibid., p. 7.

[23] Ibid. pp. 7-8.

[24] Walt's argument was quoted in Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, pp. 3-4. See also Stephen M. Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies" *International Studies Quarterly* Vol 35, No. 2 (1991), pp. 211-239.

[25] Ibid, p. 213.

and counterproductive effects on the entire fabric of social and international relations."[26]

Likewise, Baylis, Wirtz, and Gray—in their 2010 book on *Strategy in the Contemporary World*—asserted that if defense and foreign policies are removed from the picture, the humanist view of security will become synonymous with well-being and people's welfare. With this, everything that might negatively affect human lives and/or ways of life is considered as a security problem. If the idea of security is expanded to accommodate all things related to human development, the former will lose its meaning and value, and so will the distinct field of National Security Studies.[27] As Baylis, Wirtz, and Gray asserted: "(m)ilitary power remains a crucial part of security and those who ignore war to concentrate on non-military threats to security do so at their peril."[28] It is for this reason that realists scholars give emphasis on strategy, i.e., use of force, at the heart of any security policy in the 21st century VUCA world.

While there is no universally accepted definition for national security, which is the case in any analytical construct in social science, there is a need to ensure logicality in defining and delimiting the use of this politically powerful label. This epistemic concern in the scholarly field has serious implications on policy. As I wrote in a 2013 article on *What the Subject of Security Really Means in the Philippines*:

> Despite the reinvention of the concept of security in the approach of the 21st century, critical thinkers warn against its obscure meanings and leanings if this is to be translated in actual policy, especially by a conservative state. Understanding the subject of security is crucial in defining a security problem and devising appropriate policy to address it.[29]

As a subject of analysis, national security is theoretically grounded, policy relevant, and strategically oriented. Only with a comprehension of these dimensions can we begin to engage in thoughtful conversations about the subject of national security. What makes a state secure or insecure is a question of theory and policy, as well as of strategy in a policy continuum. For instance, realist scholars will explain that power disparity in the international system is both the source of threat and the means of security. Thus, sovereign states build up their militaries as deterrence or defense against aggression and as leverage in international politics. Liberals, on the other hand, will argue that the use of force is not necessary and sufficient for national and international security. For this reason, powerful nations strive to build international institutions, create international laws, and foster economic cooperation among diverse countries for international peace, stability, and prosperity.

In the 2015 article with the title of *Perspective on National Security Policy Framing*, I defined national security as an enduring principle and purpose of the state, which is communicated in the language of policy and strategy.[30] In this regard, I see national security as a policy statement of what the country intends to do and how it will use its power sources and security networks to protect the national interests. This is primordial in the constitution of any sovereign and independent republic.[31] It must be noted that the *raison d'etre* of the state is to provide law and order, public safety, and national security in its sovereign territory. The state ought to have the monopoly and legitimacy to use force and organized violence in order for it to eliminate sub-state violence, deter external aggression, and defend itself against enemy attack.[32] However, it cannot be refuted that a state too could abuse and misuse

[26] Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, pp. 1-2.

[27] John Baylis, James J. Wirtz, and Colin Gray, *Strategy in the Contemporary World Third Edition* (Oxford, England: University of Oxford Press, 2010), p. 13.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Almase, 2013, p. 86.

My earlier thoughts about the policy-orientedness of security is the same as those of Caldwell and Williams who asserted in 2016 that decisions are based on some definition of security. As they wrote: "Our starting point is the assumption that the quest for security must begin with a thorough understanding of the sources of security; solutions must always be grounded in an understanding of the problems." [Caldwell and Williams, 2016, p.20.]

[29] Almase, 2015, p. 28.

[31] Ananda Devi D. Almase, "From Policy to Strategy: The Quest for a Real National Security Strategy in the Philippines," *Philippine Public Safety Review* Vol. 2, No. 2 (2016), p. 15.

[32] Here, I refer mainly to fully developed states with credible defense posture. Newly independent states with weak armed

military and police powers against its own citizens in the name of national security. Drawing from the lessons of history, there is also a need to effectively govern the use of force within the domestic domain, which is the concern of security sector reform.

In their 2016 book on *Seeking Security in an Insecure World*, Caldwell and Williams defined national security as principally concerned with threats that are *traditional* [i.e., from rival powers and other states], *non-traditional* [i.e., from transnational, non-state actors such as international terrorists and criminal groups; and from other souces of threats such as climate change, natural disasters, and pandemics]. All these are matters of national security because they pose serious threats to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political and economic systems of a state.[33] Although the American perspective of national security is largely external in nature, Caldwell and Williams recognized that intrastate conflict—particularly in weak and failing states—is the modern face of war.[34]

In the tradition of National Security Studies, national security policy and defense policy are generally regarded as interchangeable whether this serves to deter external threats—in the case of developed democracies in the West, or to suppress rebellion and drug-related crimes—in the context of some dictatorial and/or developing countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.[35] This perspective of national security policy clarifies that the condition of stability or secure relationship is only possible when a state undertakes effective countermeasures to stabilize conflictual or threatening relations.[36]

All in all, national security cannot just be constructed or reinvented without regard to its real nature, political purpose, and policy cost. When this happens, the true meaning of national security will be diluted and debased. Hence, there is a need to be educated on what national security really means for this to have any value to the study and praxis of the field.

National security is an extraordinary policy

That national security is an extraordinary policy is evident from its distinct characteristics: politics of existential threat, national emergency, sense of urgency, state mobilization, use of force and/or extraordinary measures, and budgetary priority. To quote from Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde's discourse on how security ought to be constructed and analyzed:

> The invocation of security has been the key to legitimizing the use of force, but more generally, it has opened the way for the state to mobilize, or to take special powers, to handle existential threats. Traditionally, by saying "security," a state representative declares an emergency condition, thus claiming a right to use whatever means are necessary to block a threatening development.[37]

According to the above-cited scholars, security must be conceptualized as something much more specific than threat to people, community, economy, and/or environment upon which government should act. To count as a matter of security—especially national security—it has to meet "strictly defined criteria" that distinguish it from regular public problems or what Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde classified as *politicized issues*. These problems, which I refer to here as regular [i.e., usual business of government], are those that are made part of public debate and/or acted upon by government. In this case, politicized problems require legislation, budget allocation, and/or executive action. To note,

forces have to rely on the security umbrella provided by their former colonizers or the United Nations (UN). Other small states, which do not have their own standing military at all, depend on powerful countries or regional security forces for national defense. Regardless of whether a country has a powerful military or not, national defense will always remain as the primary agenda of national security even without the rhetorical drama of securitization.

[33] Caldwell and Williams, p. 257.
[34] Ibid., pp. 192 & 196.
[35] Ibid., p. 9.
[36] Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, p. 4
[37] Ibid., p. 21.

non-politicized issues are not in the policy agenda, which means they can be taken care of without a need for government intervention. In a conceptual spectrum devised by Buzan et al., politicization of a public issue is distinguished from securitization of a threating condition. The dichotomy in their typology explains the gravity and extremity of securitizing a problem by removing this from regular procedures of government.[38]

For a problem to be *securitized*, it has to be staged as an existential threat by the securitizing actor [i.e., the president] who generates endorsement of extraordinary measure that would not be warranted if the issue were not given the security label in a powerful speech act.[39] There should be an urgency and an utmost priority to protect a security referent [e.g., nation, territory, military posture, public safety, constitution, and political regime] that has the legitimate claim to survive; otherwise, the future would be sacrificed. Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde wrote that the security discourse has to take "the form of existential threats, point of no return, and necessity" in order to "gain enough resonance for a platform to be made from which it is possible to legitimize emergency measures."[40] Because, according to these scholars, "if the problem is not handled now it will be too late, and we will not exist to remedy our failure."[41]

From my previous study of the presidency, former Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos' public address on suspending the writ of habeas corpus in 1971 can be taken as a perfect example of a speech act that had the logic and rhetoric of securitization. To quote from his speech:

> In my study of revolution,there is one lesson that we have learned and that is, we can tolerate subversion, we can tolerate dissension, we can tolerate conspiracy against state and against our Republic only to a certain extent. Beyond that point, if you allow the insurgency to grow, then the disease would so worsen that it could paralyze the entire body politic, and the state and the Republic will be lost. I say it and I declare it: we have reached a point when tolerance must end. The ultimate point of tolerance, the point of no return, has been reached and we can no longer allow the Communists to grow stronger. If they grow stronger, two years from now no government would be able to dismantle the communist apparatus without very heavy cost. Because of this, now is the time to act.[42] [Underline provided.]

President Marcos followed through his securitization move when he stated the following in his State of the Nation Address (SONA) in January 1972, eight months before his declaration of martial law in September of the same year.

> The most urgent problem of the nation today—possibly through the rest of the decade—is the problem of peace and order. All our plans for development, themselves urgent, are contingent upon our successful management of this grave national problem. Only in conditions of calm and social stability may we hope to undertake the manifold and diverse tasks necessary for sustained growth. Peace and order, therefore, leads the agenda of government through the remainder of my Administration. I am determined that the challenge to public authority posed by criminal and lawless elements will be met this year and the next with all the power and resources of the government.[43] [Underline provided.]

It can be seen from Marcos' speech acts that a security discourse has all the essential elements of a policy argumentation. William Dunn, in his 2012 textbook on *Public Policy Analysis*, presented the following elements that constitute a compelling argument for policy: *policy relevant information* [e.g.,

[38] Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, p. 25.
[39] Ibid., p. 5.
[40] Ibid., pp. 23-24.
[41] Ibid., p. 26.
[42] "The Suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus," Address of Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Republic of the Philippines, at a Meeting with Local Chief Executives on 1 September 1971. Parts of the speech was quoted in the Chapter on "Authoritarian Administration and the Campaign for Democratic Revolution for National Security and Social Equity, 1971-1985," in Ananda Devi D. Almase, *A Saga of Administrative Thought in Presidential Rhetoric: An Analysis of the State of the Nation Addresses and Speeches of Philippines Presidents, 1935-2006* (Dissertation submitted to the National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, 2007), pp. 317-318.
[43] "Strength Through Crisis, Growth in Freedom," State of the Nation Message of President Ferdinand E. Marcos on 24 January 1972. Parts of the speech was quoted in Almase, 2007, p. 319.

existential threat of growing communist insurgency]; *policy claim* [e.g., suspension of the writ of habeas corpus], *warrant* [e.g., justification for securitization], and *backing* [e.g., reference to cases of failing states if insurgency is allowed to grow].[44] A well-argued policy position will have more explanatory power when it is not only focused on its own agenda but also conscious of counterargument(s). It should not only explicate a policy choice but also anticipate and address opposing views.

President Rodrigo R. Duterte's speech act in the war against illegal drugs in the Philippines is another example of a security discourse that has all the aforementioned elements of a policy argumentation. As the firebrand President stated in his inaugural address in 2016:

> I know that there are those who do not approve of my methods of fighting criminality. . . and illegal drugs and corruption. They say that my methods are unorthodox and verge on the illegal. In response let me say this: . . . I have seen how illegal drugs destroyed individuals and ruined family relationships. I have seen how criminality, by means all foul, snatched from the innocent and the unsuspecting, the years and years of accumulated savings. . . In this fight, I ask Congress and the Commission on Human Rights and all others who are similarly situated to allow us a level of governance that is consistent to our mandate. The fight will be relentless and it will be sustained.[45] [Underline provided.]

A quintessential case of how securitization theory operates in an unfamiliar security situation is the worldwide policy to combat the novel coronavirus disease in 2019, otherwise known as COVID-19. A severe and acute respiratory disease, COVID-19 has common symptoms of flu, fever, and shortness of breath that could lead to pneumonia, multi-organ failure, and death. At no time in world history did nations experience a devastating infectious disease that rapidly spread across the globe in an unprecedented rate and scale like COVID-19. The first case of the COVID-19 was identified in Wuhan City in China in December 2019 and travelled quickly to 210 countries and territories, forcing cities and communities around the world into quarantine and lockdown for the first time. On 30 January 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared a public health emergency to alert the international community about the existential crisis of the COVID-19. On 11 March 2020, the WHO raised the alarm at the level of a pandemic, which means the epidemic had become worldwide, crossed national boundaries, and affected large number of people. Before the end of April 2020, more than 2.6 million people got infected by COVID-19, while more than 180,000 died of the disease in various countries. A year after in April 2021, more than 132.5 million people contracted the virus, resulting in 2.8 million deaths around the world.[46]

A largely invisible and non-human threat, COVID-19 crossed borders undetected and devastated people by surprise. Even a strong military, which can destroy an enemy's capability and morale, does not have the power to deter nor defeat this kind of threat. This is a nemesis that is not capable of reasoning, unlike rational states or nations that had settled wars in the previous century and past millennia. The COVID-19 is a faceless and formless threat whose very nature does not fit the definition of "threat" in classical realism,[47] but does change the landscape and mindset of security in the twenty-first century.

As world history shows, plagues and pandemics are old. However, their inclusion in contemporary research agenda of International Relations and National Security Studies is new. Buzan et al.'s securitization theory, which broadens the security agenda, helps us understand why and how public health and safety is being securitized by government as a matter of policy. Securitization of a public health problem means controlling the spread of the disease, taking care of the sick, and protecting

[44] Dunn, 2012, pp. 20-22.

[45] See Inaugural Address of President Rodrigo R. Duterte delivered at Malacanang Palace on 30 June 2016.

[46] "COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic," *Worldometer,* 6 April 2021, https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/.

[47] For realist scholars, a security-worthy threat means a state or a non-state actor with the capability and intent to do harm against another state. Apart from traditional threats of great power rivalry, armed conflicts, and weapons of mass destruction, the new security agenda have broadened to include transnational crimes, climate change, and infectious diseases. Although the human intent is absent in the threat formula of some new sources of insecurities—like environmental disasters and pandemics—their natural and deterministic processes to devastate people and societies are clear as day. [Caldwell and Williams, pp. 13-15.]

the people from infection in ways beyond the normal, day-to-day business of government. It means taking aggressive and extreme measures [e.g., lockdown] to fight the infectious disease before it is too late for government to act on the existential threat to human security. In times of national emergency, securitization could be the only option for people, as well as the system, to survive. Restricting their civil liberties—such as suspending their freedom of movement and other non-essential operations—is a hard decision taken as a necessity by government and accepted as a civic duty by citizens. Securitization calls for difficult sacrifices, which would be totally unimaginable in a democratic society if it had not been devasted by the pandemic.[48]

It is not uncommon for people outside of National Security Studies to think about security as a universally good thing and a desirable end-state. But the securitization theory of the British school argues the opposite: security is a negative condition and a failure of dealing with the problem through normal politics and procedures. Unless securitization is avoidable, the ideal state of affairs is the usual politics of democratic control. But this will have to take a back seat if and when the nation is in crisis. Under this condition, the extraordinary exemption from the business as usual attitude of government is a necessary action. That being the case, a security policy should not be taken lightly because it comes with a huge cost and risk.[49] Those who desire security must be willing to pay a high price. This is particularly true in the securitization of non-traditional security problems in public safety administration. Securitization has counterproductive effects to other sectoral interests, which is why securitization must be carefully weighed in and out by government. This is a core argument in national security policy analysis.

National Security Studies is about policy analysis

In essence, the logic of securitization is structured using the elements of a policy argument, which is the subject of analysis in National Security Studies. Scholars can very well identify this pattern through discourse analysis of the speech acts of securitizing actors—whose extraordinary ways of managing security problems made a difference in their countries' administrative histories.

For Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, securitization constitutes the analytically valid meaning of security. They succinctly described security studies as an academic field that is concerned about "who can speak and do security successfully, on what issues, under what conditions and with what effects."[50] Some of the key questions raised by these scholars are as follows: What will happen if we securitize and if we do not? Do we choose to attach a security label with ensuing consequences, which are both intended and unintended?[51] What are the effects of these security acts? Who influenced decisions? Is it a good idea to make an issue a matter of national security concern, thereby transferring it to the agenda of "panic politics," or should it be better handled by normal politics?[52] All in all, these questions are the substance of national security policy analysis. The queries point to the reality that securitization is a

[48] In the Philippines, the national government in March 2020 came up with an emergency act consisting of different kinds of policy measures: regulatory, distributive, and constituent. Their complementary objectives are as follows: to mitigate the transmission of the 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19); to deliver goods and basic necessities to indigent families and individuals affected by the imposed community quarantine; to provide social amelioration program and safety nets to affected sectors during the pandemic; and, to establish health care facilities and testing centers for COVID-19 in concerned local governments units. See Declaration of Policy in Section 3 of Republic Act No. 11469, otherwise known as "Bayanihan to Heal as One Act." [Congress of the Philippines, AN ACT DECLARING THE EXISTENCE OF A NATIONAL EMERGENCY ARISING FROM THE CORONAVIRUS DISEASE 2019 (COVID-19) SITUATION AND A NATIONAL POLICY IN CONNECTION THEREWITH, AND AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES FOR A LIMITED PERIOD AND SUBJECT TO RESTRICTIONS, TO EXERCISE POWERS NECESSARY AND PROPER TO CARRY OUT THE DECLARED NATIONAL POLICY AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, Eighteenth Congress (23 March 2020), Republic Act No. 11469.]

[49] As Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde wrote: "National security should not be idealized. It works to silence opposition and has given power holders many opportunities to exploit "threats" for domestic purposes, to claim a right to handle something with less democratic control and constraint. Our belief, therefore, is not "the more security the better." Basically, security should be seen as negative, as a failure to deal with issues as normal politics." [Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, pp. 4 & 29.]

[50] Ibid., pp. 27 & 32.

[51] Ibid., pp. 32-33.

[52] Ibid., p. 34.

difficult decision and a very costly policy action. It is for this reason that a security policy, in the real sense of the word, should be given much more careful thought by scholars, analysts, and policymakers.

National Security Studies is about policy analysis: from problem structuring, agenda setting, and decision-making; to implementing, monitoring, and recalibrating policy for national security. As I introduced in the beginning, policy analysis generally refers to selection of desired goals and courses of action based on particular interests and value preferences vis a vis some costs and trade-offs. It is also about the analysis of the causes, content, context, conduct, and consequences of policy.

For scholars of national security, the fundamental concerns in policy analysis are: what the nature of threat is; what national interests are at stake; why a problem becomes a security issue; and, how this is argued as part of the security agenda, which means this must be prioritized over non-security issues. It is in this light that policy analysis should be the end-all and be-all of National Security Studies, especially in NDCP.

How National Security Policy Analysis Compares with Normal Public Policy Analysis

Policy analysis reflects for the most part the theoretical frames and value preferences of the areas of study in which policy problems are examined. While the basic logic of policy analysis in Public Administration is the same as that of National Security Studies, the latter has different set of beliefs and reasons for determining what should be done against threat to national interest. The existence of threat—which can be an enemy or a phenomenon with the capacity and/or intention to destroy a country—is a key concern in national security policy analysis. The nature of the security environment, in which security actors and strategic players operate, also changes the rules of the game or the criteria for policy-making.

Understanding the kind of politics that engenders national security policy is fundamental to analyzing its content and context. It must be noted that the policy regime of national security is not regular and regulated. It is also not confined to the domestic domain where government has absolute authority to make policy, compel citizens to follow the rule of law, and impose penalty on law breakers. Having said that, national security policy is not directed at routine problems concerning the bureaucracy, local governance, or public administration at large. Rather, national security policy is aimed at managing extraordinary problems in a strategic setting over which government has no complete control. This is especially true in the international political system where there is no governing authority above sovereign states as well as independent non-state actors.

In view of the foregoing, national security policy analysis has a distinctive character when compared with what I call *normal public policy analysis*. I have at least two broad reasons for this perspective: First, national security policy analysis has particular paradigms for making sense of security problems in the strategic setting. And second, it has peculiar parameters for making value statements on a best course of action to take to protect the country's core interests. In both cases, the unique rhetoric of policy analysis in national security affairs can be distinguished from the usual semantics of policy analysis in public administration and governance. The significant nuances and differences between the two must be understood deeply, especially by newbies in policy studies.

Table 1. Comparison Between Normal Public Policy Analysis and National Security Policy Analysis

FUNDAMENTALS of POLICY ANALYSIS	NORMAL PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS	NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY ANALYSIS
1. Subjects of analysis	▪ Policy problem with which a government agency or department is concerned ▪ Policy advocacy ▪ Bill in congress or senate ▪ Public policy of national or local government	▪ Strategic options for national security ▪ Defense, security, and/or foreign policy of a state ▪ Defense treaty, defense agreement, and security cooperation between or among states
2. Paradigms and frameworks of analysis	▪ Based on theories of Public Administration and Governance [e.g., bureaucratic politics, issue networks, and public choice theory]	▪ Based on theories of International Relations and/or its sub-field of National Security Studies [e.g., realism, constructivism, and liberalism]
3. Nature of the policy problem	▪ Needs-based ▪ Internal and local ▪ Ordinary ▪ "Politicized"	▪ Threat-based and crisis oriented ▪ External as well as internal ▪ Extraordinary ▪ "Securitized"
4. Assumptions about the policy environment	▪ Continuous ▪ Stable and predictable ▪ Known ▪ Transparent and democratic ▪ Authoritative (domestic policy system) ▪ Regulated and/or governed	▪ Changing and conflictual ▪ Volatile and unpredictable ▪ Unknown and ambiguous ▪ Secretive and unilateral ▪ Anarchic (international political system) ▪ Unregulated, negotiated, managed and/or balanced
5. Nature of politics in policymaking	▪ "Low politics" ▪ Due process ▪ Democratic consultation ▪ Routine decision	▪ "High politics" ▪ Emergency action ▪ Executive decision ▪ Difficult decision
6. Key policy actors	▪ President as Chief Legislator and Chief Executive ▪ Legislators ▪ Elected public officials in the executive [i.e., local government units] ▪ Civil servants and other public administrators ▪ Police, prosecutors, courts, correctional officers	▪ President as Head of State, Commander-in-Chief, Chief Architect of Foreign Policy, Chief Negotiator, and "securitizing actor" ▪ Military ▪ Diplomats ▪ Foreign counterparts ▪ National security agencies ▪ Congress (for treaty ratification, budget allocation, and other functions related to national security)

FUNDAMENTALS of POLICY ANALYSIS	NORMAL PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS	NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY ANALYSIS
7. Value preferences	▪ Good governance [e.g., rule of law, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, economy, equity, participation, and public interest] ▪ Development	▪ National security [i.e., sovereignty to choose domestic and foreign policies, national defense, national survival, and other core national interests]
8. Purposes and functions of policy	▪ To ensure effectiveness, efficiency, economy, responsiveness, and accountability in government administration ▪ To extract, generate, and allocate resources for public good and general welfare ▪ To deliver basic services ▪ To capacitate people and foster economic development ▪ To maintain law and order ▪ To enforce regulations, as well as court decisions ▪ To sanction actions and/or punish lawbreakers ▪ To resolve disputes through the legal system	▪ To protect the national interests ▪ To defend the state [i.e., territory, government entity, and citizenry] against the enemy or other existential threats ▪ To authorize use of force and/or other extraordinary measures against the enemy and/or for national survival ▪ To project power as credible deterrence against offensive action by another state or by non-state actors ▪ To influence, pressure, bind, threaten, incentivize, balance, engage, and/or isolate another state (or non-state actors) for national security ▪ To manage conflict using instruments of state power, as well as norms and agreed rules of international institutions
9. Purposes and functions of policy analysis	▪ To rationalize policy options and recommend a best course of action in accordance with constitutional law ▪ To argue and advocate for a policy solution ▪ To analyze the content and context of policy ▪ To determine how policy can be pursued in line with the value preferences stated in item # 7 above	▪ To rationalize policy options and recommend a best course of action in line with the national interest ▪ To make a strong case for securitization—if and when deemed necessary ▪ To investigate the core properties of security policy ▪ To deconstruct a security argument or a speech act ▪ To explain the causes and circumstances of security policy ▪ To determine how national security goals can be pursued in line with the value preferences stated in item # 7 above

FUNDAMENTALS of POLICY ANALYSIS	NORMAL PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS	NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY ANALYSIS
(cont'd)	▪ To provide policy relevant data and information for legislators and/or decision-makers in the executive branch	▪ To provide intelligence research and analysis for the President, as well as other strategic managers, on the use of state powers for defense and security ▪ To rank and weigh up comparative values [i.e., costs & benefits, as well as trade-offs & pay-offs] of policy bets ▪ To minimize risks of failure by figuring out beforehand whether policy options are wise and likely to succeed
	▪ To determine perceptions of key stakeholders, supporters, as well as oppositionists about the agenda, determination, and/or implementation of policy	▪ To understand the behavior(s) and interest(s) of the other state(s) or player(s) in order to anticipate its/their possible actions and/or reactions ▪ To create future scenarios in order to be aware of possible spoilers and blowbacks of policy alternatives
	▪ To evaluate policy performance in order to improve this	▪ To examine performance of ongoing policy and/or strategy in order to provide mid-course guidance on how to correct it, and also to determine whether or when it should be terminated and/or replaced
10. Policy models	▪ Rational and political ▪ Institutional	▪ Rational and political ▪ Strategic
11. Levels of analysis	▪ Organizational/governmental ▪ Local/sectoral/societal ▪ National	▪ Individual [i.e., head of state] ▪ State and/or sub-state ▪ International
12. Kinds and methods of policy analysis	▪ Analysis FOR policy: a. Stakeholder analysis b. Statistical analysis c. Forecasting d. Program evaluation e. Operations research ▪ Analysis OF policy: a. Analysis of policy determination b. Case study (single or comparative) c. Content analysis d. Other analytical perspectives [e.g., historical & sociological]	▪ Analysis FOR policy: a. Strategic evaluation b. Wargaming c. Scenario-building d. Systems analysis e. Operations research ▪ Analysis OF policy: a. Analysis of policy determination or foreign policy analysis b. Case study (single or comparative) c. Discourse analysis d. Other analytical perspectives [e.g., historical & sociological]

Based on extensive review of academic literature, I outlined in *Table 1* some basic, characteristic concepts that compare national security policy analysis with normal public policy analysis. The following are the fundamental constructs that distinguish the two fields of study: (1) subjects of analysis; (2) paradigms and frameworks of analysis; (3) nature of the policy problem; (4) assumptions about the policy environment; (5) nature of politics in policy-making; (6) key policy actors; (7) value preferences; (8) purposes and functions of policy; (9) purposes and functions of policy analysis; (10) policy models; (11) levels of analysis; and, (12) kinds and methods of policy analysis.

The paradigmatic biases of policy analysis as applied in public administration and in national security affairs make one distinct from the other. Unless analysts make heads and tails out of these unique bases of knowledge, they cannot get their analysis right. If they are not grounded on the realities of the security regime, their value judgement will likely be determined by regular rules and procedures of policy making. Their argument and/or recommendation on what to do about an existential threat and how to go about resolving it—the way people are accustomed to in administering a public bureaucracy—will not simply work in a different context of security and survival. That being said, a deeper understanding of the nuances and uniqueness of national security policy analysis is crucial in making better judgement of a security situation and in taking a strategic course of action at the most opportune time.

Kinds and Methods of Analyzing Policy Choices

Policy analysis uses a methodology or a system of methods to explain a policy choice or prescribe a best policy option. Richard Kugler, in his 2006 book entitled *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era*, defined methodology as the "entire intellectual process" through which analytical products are generated: from framing the correct policy problem and asking the right questions, to getting relevant information and producing directive knowledge.[53]

Calling his work as a "thinking person's book," Kugler argued that the methodology required from policy analysts is highly conceptual and creative.[54] This can be explained more fully by his own writings, which I quote below:

> The term analytical methods is often misinterpreted to mean scientific techniques for gathering and interpreting data. But methodology is far more than this narrow function. For example, Einstein said that he relied on "thought experiments"(*gedan-kenexperimenten*), not laboratory testing, to create his theory of relativity. Creative and disciplined thinking, not measuring, was the heart of his methodology for theoretical physics. Such thinking is, similarly, at the heart of policy analysis.[55] (Underline provided.)

This part of the paper delves on the methods and approaches of policy analysis from the *quantitative* and *qualitative* paradigms in social science research. Policy analysts, as well as other social scientists, examine policy choices for two reasons: to evaluate policy options and recommend a best course of action, which we call as *analysis FOR policy*; and to explain the reasons behind a policy decision, which we call as *analysis OF policy*. Under these two kinds of policy analysis, I will define various methods and approaches to policy analysis and also give few examples of topics and queries that I worked on in previous research. I will also add tables of the general guidelines and logical procedures on how to conduct an analysis FOR policy in national security administration and also on how to write analysis OF policy in the academia.

[53] Kugler, p. 20.
[54] Ibid., p. xv.
[55] Ibid., p. 18.

Two types of policy analysis as to paradigm: quantitative and qualitative

There are two general types of policy analysis as an applied social science research: *quantitative* and *qualitative*.[56] These are research paradigms with their own sets of *ontology* [i.e., how analysts look at the essence of a thing/phenomenon/problem under investigation], *epistemology* [i.e., how analysts explain the subject and communicate such explanation as knowledge to other people], and *methodology* [i.e., how analysts use framework of analysis and resolve policy inquiry].[57] A methodology is driven by intelligent questions that set things in motion—whether in a discipline-oriented, problem-oriented, or applications-oriented policy analysis.[58] A theory-based process of inquiry weaves the essential parts of the analysis and gives it logic. This is not only true for an academic policy research submitted by a student to the faculty in school, but also for a "quick policy analysis"[59] provided by a technical staff to the client or decision-maker in government.

Quantitative policy analysis. This type of study is rooted on the ontological idea that reality is given in a natural world, independent of human cognition or experience. Scientists from this school of thought believe that reality is and should be objective; otherwise, it is not real and thus not worth looking at. The units of analysis must be factual in order to be accounted for, measured, and related. Logical relations between or among discreet variables are established and generalized for all other cases. This epistemological principle is what is known as *logical positivism*, which is thought to be the only legitimate form of knowledge in the tradition of quantitative paradigm. For instance, national power is measured in terms of military capability, economic wealth, population, and other quantifiable assets that make a state great and secure. The objective indicators of power determine the position and ambition of a sovereign and self-interested state, a theoretical assumption regarded as true for all others in anarchic, international politics. This neo-realist theory not only explains state behavior in a naturalistic, strategic environment; it also calculates and predicts policy actions of rational actors when faced with systemic threats. This type of policy analysis uses scientific method(s) and/or mathematical model(s) of data collection, correlation, and projection to test hypotheses and confirm an established theory. The quantitative methodology is prescribed for analyzing samples of the population and generalizing the findings for the entire universe, or simply put, for the entire set of elements relevant to the discussion. However, the field of social science is far more complex than hard facts and discreet numbers.

Qualitative policy analysis. This type of study is grounded on the ontological belief that reality is socially constructed, experienced, and/or agreed by human agents. Values and perceptions are central to sense-making and knowledge production, which make the latter essentially relative and intersubjective. A good example of this epistemic principle is a constructivist theory that frames the analysis of how culture and norms influence a national security policy, or how threat perceptions make weak states insecure about powerful ones. Qualitative analysis uses idiographic methodology to diagnose a policy problem, construct an argument, gather information, and discuss findings. Its research strategy includes extensive review of the literature, document analysis, interview of key informants, and/or insights of the researcher herself/himself. Kugler wrote that national security policy analysis requires "the dynamics of reasoned creativity and deliberate scrutiny."[60] In this respect, the qualitative methodology is appropriate for understanding complex security problem, explaining the motivation of policy actors, arguing in favor of a policy alternative, deconstructing a security discourse, and building future scenario(s). Here,

[56] For discussions on the qualitative and quantitative paradigms in social research, see John W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Thousand Oaks, California, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014).

[57] For discussions of the subjective and objective dimensions of ontology, epistemology, and methodology, see Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan, "In Search of a Framework: Assumptions about the Nature of Social Science" in *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis* (Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005), pp. 1-7.

[58] The three types of policy analysis discussed by Dunn, in the Third Edition of his textbook on *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*, are: discipline-oriented, problem-oriented, and applications-oriented policy analysis. [Dunn, 2012, p.12.]

[59] Patton and Sawicki termed a practical decision-analysis as "quick, basic policy analysis." This is distinguished from policy research of scholars in the academic community.

[60] Kugler, p. 20.

qualitative insights are given more emphasis than the techniques of data collection. To a greater extent, the value preference and evaluation criteria define the quality of analysis.

On the whole, interdisciplinary studies of national security policy employ both qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. It is within any of these paradigms, or a combination thereof, that policy analysis must be consciously formulated in order to produce powerful explanation either of a policy decision or a policy recommendation. It must be noted that policy analysis—whether in regular public management or in national security administration—has no pretensions of being a real science. This is because the field of social science, from where policy analysis is derived, does not have a singular or universal set of values, general laws, and methods of research. As Martin Minogue wrote in a classic journal article on *Theory and Practice in Public Policy and Administration* in 1983, policy analysis is informed by a "theoretically sound perception that issues of public policy do not lend themselves to neutral, value free, scientific analysis."[61] For Allan Stolberg, in his 2012 article on *Making National Security Policy in the 21st Century*, policy-making "has never been a science, and the art form remains inexact at best." Stolberg further asserted that national security policy-making "is complex, depends on numerous variables, and often has to rely on a bit of luck."[62]

Two kinds of policy analysis as to purpose: analysis FOR policy and analysis OF policy

Having defined the two types of policy analysis as to paradigm, we now go to the discussions of the two kinds of policy analysis as to purpose. In my course syllabus on *National Security Policy Analysis* in NDCP, I wrote that students are expected to learn about the types and methods of policy analysis in order for them to: (1) choose from a variety of approaches by which to analyze policy in the field of national security; (2) know how policy analysis can be conducted before, during, and/or after the policy execution; (3) inquire about the decision-making processes as well as the broader context within which certain policy actions or reactions have to be considered; (4) examine the component parts of a policy problem, evaluate options vis a vis their likely consequences and political costs, and recommend a best course of action when doing an analysis for policy; and, (5) ask insightful research questions about key issues of policy debates and/or policy cases when doing a scholarly analysis of policy.[63] The last two objectives pertain to the two kinds of policy analysis: *analysis FOR policy,* which are produced by technical personnel in executive and legislative offices; and *analysis OF policy*, which are written by scholars in the academe.[64]

Analysis FOR policy. As can be seen in the last item in *Table 1*, the methods under the analysis FOR policy are the following: *strategic evaluation, wargaming,*[65] *scenario-building,*[66] *systems analysis*, and

[61] Minogue, in his classic article on "Theory and Practice in Public Policy and Administration," asserted that Policy Science "has no real claim to be a science." For the author, "the most interesting and illuminating method" of analyzing policy issues and problems is on the bases of a "sound historical groundwork" and of a "strongly developed consciousness of the primary influence of politics." [Martin Minogue, "Theory and Practice in Public Policy Administration," *Policy and Politics* Vol. 11, No. 1 (1983), pp. 63-95.]

[62] Stolberg, p. 41.

[63] I designed the *NSA 203: National Security Policy Analysis Course* for beginners in the study and conduct of policy analysis. Aside from learning about the types and kinds of policy analysis, the four other objectives of NSA 203 are for students to: (1) know the fundamental constructs of policy analysis in national security affairs in order to (1.a) be familiar about the language and literature of this specialized field of inquiry, and (1.b) be knowledgeable about theories and theory-building in policy analysis; (2) appreciate the value of theoretical perspectives in national security policy analysis in order to (2.a) frame policy problems about national security, (2.b) understand why and how national security policy is determined, and (2.c) develop coherent explanations and arguments in favor of (or against) policy decisions for national security; and, (3) gain deeper knowledge as to why policy analysis is central to National Security studies and crucial to decision-making on matters of national security. [See Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, *NSA 203: National Security Policy Analysis Syllabus* (National Defense College of the Philippines, Camp Aguinaldo, Quezon City, 2020).]

[64] *Analysis FOR policy* and *analysis OF policy* are labels borrowed from the typology of policy analysis in Gordon, Lewis, and Young's "Perspectives on Policy Analysis," *The Policy Process: A Reader* ed. by Michael Hill (Great Britain: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), p.5.

[65] *Wargaming* is a mental modeling of a conflict or competitive situation in which actors make important decisions based on their assessment of possible consequences of their decisions [e.g., how others would likely respond, and how the dynamics could change]; as well as on established norms, rules, and role expectations. For further readings on the philosophy, epistemology, and methodology of *national security policy game*, see Elizabeth M. Bartels, *Building Better Games for National Security Policy Analysis: Towards a Social Scientific Approach* (Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation, 2020), https://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD437.html.

[66] Scenario-building is an analysis of possible future(s) based on some patterns of behavior in the past. Knowledge about what

operations research. Aside from this set, there are other practical techniques of analyzing policy options when making decisions in competitive fields.[67] These have practical use not just for defense organizations but also for private industries, which continuously assess their capabilities in relation to those of other players and also to the dynamic environment in which they operate. Anticipation of and preparation for future threats will minimize risks and increase chances of success and/or survival of strategic organizations.

In the following sections, I will discuss three selected methods of policy analysis: (1) *strategic evaluation*; (2) *systems analysis*; and (3) *operations research*.[68] I will briefly define each method as well as discuss its research agenda and paradigm [e.g., area of interest, policy questions, and analytical frameworks or tools]. These methods are generally aimed at rationalizing and/or recommending a best course of action; hence, these fall under the label of analysis FOR policy. The selection is appropriate for individual students who cannot do group projects [e.g., wargaming and simulation exercises] for national security policy analysis.

(1) Strategic evaluation. As applied in national security affairs, strategic evaluation is defined by Kugler as a qualitative method of analysis that has "macroscopic focus" on how a state should conduct its national security policy and/or strategy.[69] This method is generally preferred by political scientists to determine policy and/or strategy that can best achieve national security interests and goals. Used for big picture subjects, strategic evaluation is based on concepts and theory, as well as national interests and/or international norms. The purpose is to make broad-gauged judgments of security issues at the level of the state and its relations with other states in the region and/or the international community. It is important to note that strategic evaluation does not aim to provide fine-grained assessments of the feasibility of particular plans and/or programs at organizational and operational levels. Rather, it seeks to explain what should be done to address a complex security problem, as well as how particular course(s) of action could affect the current state of affairs, at the strategic level.[70]

For example, the question of "how should countries respond to acts of terrorism?" is in line with strategic evaluation. This, along with other case studies with question titles, can be read in the 2003 book on *You Decide!: Controversial Global Issues*.[71] Other examples of research questions in strategic evaluation are as follows: How should the Philippines deal with China to ease tension in the West Philippine Sea? How should the Philippines leverage on the termination of the Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) with the United States (US) to push for the Philippines' security interests? How should the Philippines hedge against strategic uncertainties posed by the US and China rivalry?

---

will likely happen—given the current situation—has policy implications that can help us prepare for contingent measures and, to some extent, gain control of the future in order to be secure. For example, in 2004, international experts and analysts created a scenario on what the future could be like for 2020. According to the Project Report on *Mapping the Global Future* of the United States (US) National Intelligence Council, terrorist attacks could slow down globalization in the year 2020 but it is the outbreak of a pandemic that could derail or even stop it. Further, the 2004 Report stated that: "Some experts believe it is only a matter of time before a new *pandemic* appears, such as the 1918–1919 influenza virus that killed an estimated 20 million worldwide. . . . Globalization would be endangered if the death toll rose into the millions in several major countries and the spread of the disease put a halt to global travel and trade during an extended period, prompting governments to expend enormous resources on overwhelmed health sectors. . ." [National Intelligence Council, *Mapping the Global Future: Report of the National Intelligence Council's 2020 Project* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Government Printing Office, 2004), p. 30.

[67] One example is SWOT analysis, which determines the *strengths* and *weaknesses* of an organizational actor vis a vis the *opportunities* and *threats* to it. All this can be part of a more comprehensive assessment of policy choices in any given situation.

[68] The three methods are sourced from Kugler's 2006 book on *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era.*

[69] Kugler, p. 29.

[70] As Kugler wrote: "Strategic evaluation is normally more theory-driven than data-driven. Typically it relies upon general theories of actions and consequences, in order to see the forest rather than be distracted by the trees. As a result, the main role of its methods is conceptual. They can help analysts to bring intellectual order to complex issues that might otherwise defy orderly appraisal, to get the issues and options right, to weigh and balance the options effectively, to portray their features and tradeoffs, and to show the conditions under which one or more of them make sense." [Ibid, p. 31.]

For further readings on the subject, see "Part I—Strategic Evaluation" in Kugler's 2006 book on *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era.* [Ibid., pp. 29-179.]

[71] See "Case 1. How Should Countries Respond to Acts of Terrorism?" in Edward Drachman, Allan Shank, Karla J. Cunningham and Jeremy Grace, *You Decide! Controversial Global Issues* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), pp. 7-36.

(2) Systems analysis. This is a mixed method of quantitative and qualitative analyses. Systems analysis uses economic models of choice that generally aim to translate policy choices into plans and programs. Preferred by managers and economists, this rational method is used for assessing cost-effectiveness and trade-offs among different plans and programs, especially those that demand large quantities of resources. It employs graphical curves and statistical relations to get the number of costs and benefits "basically right, but not to an extreme degree of precision," as Kugler stressed.[72] Systems analysis is used to help design how policy choices or grand strategies are to be carried out, and what amount of effort and resources are to be employed for each of those options.

Some examples of research problem in systems analysis are: How should the Philippines best pursue the modernization and transformation of its armed forces into an externally oriented force while at the same time make its ground forces effective in internal security operations? Will the armed forces benefit more from acquiring big-ticket-items [e.g., tanks, ships, planes, and submarines] rather than developing cyber capabilities for asymmetric warfare? Other general questions are as follows: What will be the cost-effectiveness of a particular plan, and how does this compare to others with same goals but with different activities and costs? Would another plan be equally effective and cost less, or cost the same and achieve more?[73]

(3) Operations Research. This method is a quantitative analysis of specific implementation steps, costing, and resource allocation priorities, which are all derived from approved plans and programs. Preferred by mathematicians, operations research (OR) is used to solve operational and technical problems using quantitative models [e.g., statistical techniques, computer simulations, decision analysis, mathematical game theory, linear programming, and probability-based models of operations]. It is used to make, as much as possible, detailed calculations of the right mix of resources to execute a program of action in the most effective, efficient, and/or economical manner. This is the most formal among the other methods of policy analysis.

Some examples of research questions in OR from Kugler's book on *Policy Analysis* are as follows: How can the US army best deploy and combine limited ballistic missile defenses, such as midcourse interceptors and boost-phase interceptors? How can the army reorganize its ground forces to prepare them for joint expeditionary warfare? How can the air force perform in a strike mission? In the case of the latter, OR may focus on a number of variables: airbase survivability, aircraft sortie rates, weapons load, target acquisition capabilities, weapons accuracy and lethality, as well as weather and terrain.[74]

The three methods of policy analysis in the preceding sections can either stand alone or complement each other. Strategic evaluation is used to analyze policy bets in the realm of high politics and strategic games. But once a broad policy framework is set and strategic lines of action are defined, systems analysis is needed to address policy questions [e.g., how plans and programs are to be designed, and what activities are to be carried out] at the level of institution or organization. On the other hand, OR is employed to determine, in more detailed ways, how financial, human, and materiel resources should be allocated in order to manage series of activities effectively, efficiently, and also economically. Rationality is determined by some predetermined criteria, which give more weight to certain values than other concerns [e.g., effectiveness and efficiency over and despite higher economic cost]. Value preferences, which are taken as guiding principles, are made at policy and strategic levels and carried down to program management and operational activities.

---

[72] Kugler, p. 21.
[73] For further readings on the subject, see "Part II—Systems Analysis" in Kugler, pp. 211-283.
[74] For further readings on the subject, see "Chapter 18—Methods of Operations Research" in Kugler, pp. 429-464.

Table 2. General Guidelines and Logical Procedures in Conducting an Analysis FOR Policy in National Security Administration
1. Define the security threat or problem along with its critical drivers in the strategic setting (foreign and/or domestic).
2. Clarify the national interest at stake along with the country's national security goals in the short, medium, or long term.
3. Determine and validate facts, assumptions, and determining factors for policy development.
4. Identify possible policy choices for a single goal (or set of polices for multiple goals).
5. Using well-defined method(s) of analysis, evaluate and compare each policy option (or set of mutually reinforcing policies) in terms of estimated costs (economic and political), tradeoffs, and other evaluation criteria; and, expected outcomes, likely consequences (both intended and unintended) of policy action(s), as well as reactions from other security players.
6. Provide balanced and objective menu of all possible choices for the principal or decision-makers, highlighting areas where particular policy options score high and/or low in the analysis. Include also different conditions and contingencies under which particular option may or may not work even if it scores high in the list.
7. Present the findings of policy analysis in policy papers and/or briefings to concerned bodies and decision-makers for approval.
8. Write strategic communication of a well-reasoned and informed policy decision for dissemination to concerned agencies, security sector, public, and/or international community.
9. Review, evaluate, and assess national security policy or goal-oriented strategy for enhancement, modification, or revision in light of emerging trends and threats in the strategic setting.
10. To accomplish the preceding task, start with the first procedure of analysis FOR policy.

Analysis OF policy. The approaches under the analysis OF policy, which I listed in the last item in *Table 1*, are the following: (1) *analysis of policy determination*; (2) *case study* [i.e., single or comparative]; (3) *discourse analysis*; and, (4) *other analytical perspectives* [e.g., historical and sociological]. The thematic labels that I am using here are general in my attempt to be inclusive of various disciplines in social sciences. In one way or another, qualitative policy studies with thoughtful research puzzles about why and how particular policies are constructed fall under any or a combination of two or more approaches. This kind of policy analysis aims to produce knowledge, enrich the academic literature, and enliven the quality of public discourse on policy issues.

Analysis OF policy usually explains the reasons for a policy decision and the conditions under which it was taken by the political leadership. A less common approach to analyzing policy is deconstructing the key elements of its argument in order to see how they are arranged into a powerful advocacy for social action.

Either way, it is not the explicit objective of this kind of analysis to recommend a best course of action, based on some rational calculations of possible options, to a client or a decision-maker. Nonetheless, the implicit intention is to be a source of enlightenment for decisionmakers, especially those who are intent to learn about the discipline of making wiser decisions. I will briefly discuss in the following sections the various approaches to analysis OF policy and also cite examples of their research agenda as applied in National Security Studies.

(1) Analysis of policy determination. This approach to policy analysis is mainly concerned about what determined policy and how it came about.[75] A terminology used in Public Administration literature, analysis of policy determination traces the inputs to policymaking and the processes through which a policy decision was carried out, usually by congress as the locus of decision-making on politicized issues. In the context of international relations for which defense and national security policies are made, analysis of policy determination is more appropriately called as foreign policy analysis (FPA). Qualitative approaches to FPA examine the sources of policy decisions as well as the broader context within which particular courses of action are taken to advance national interests.[76]

Using theoretical frame(s) from International Relations or National Security Studies, FPA aims to explain a policy choice by focusing on significant factors at particular level(s) of analysis. Some factors that could have determined policy are as follows: perceptions and/or motivations of the foreign policy maker, who is the President, at the *individual level*; bureaucratic politics and/or decision-making processes at the *institutional level*; historical experiences and/or patterns of social relations at the *societal level*; system of government, economic structures, and/or military power at the *state level*; and, threats, strategic position, and/or great power competition at the *international level*.[77]

For example, in the 2017 article on *Explaining the Philippines' Defense Policy*, I asked a very basic question that other analysts would also ask in an analysis of policy determination: "What are the factors and conditions that can best explain the Philippine defense policy?" My policy inquiry was based on the premise that the armed forces are weak and just internally oriented, and that the country has no national security strategy—despite its rich natural resources, booming economy, strategic location, and talented people.[78] Another example is the 2018 article on *Role Conception and Conduct of Duterte's Security Policy*, in which I raised the following questions: "What is President Duterte's role perception for the Filipino nation, which is translated as a matter of principle in his national security policy? What are the sources of explanation for this role? How does this conceived role drive the strategic orientation and direction of the country under his presidency?"[79] Other examples of theory-based questions can be found in my 2019 article with this title: *Fishing in Troubled Waters: Defense Stature as Explanatory Factor for Duterte's Stand in the West Philippine Sea.* Here, I asked the following questions: "How does the Philippines' defence posture serve as an explanatory

[75] *Analysis of policy determination* is a term used by Gordon, Lewis, and Young in their typology of policy analysis. [Gordon, Lewis, and Young, pp. 7-8.]

[76] Chris Alden and Amnon Aran, *Foreign Policy Analysis: New Approaches* (London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2012), p. 1.

[77] The five levels of analysis [i.e., individual, institutional, societal, domestic, and strategic] were discussed in my lectures on national security policy at NDCP. These are the expanded version of the three levels of analysis [i.e., individual, state, and international] in International Relations.

[78] As I wrote in my 2017 article on explaining the Philippines' defense policy: "A realist theory of defence and security argues that certain variables at the systemic level of states determine the defence policies of sovereign countries. Alongside these systemic givens are domestic factors—such as geographical features, natural resources, population, economy, technology, government system, and military—which affect the ability of a country to protect its interests and adapt to emerging security dynamics. However, if a state with talented people, rich natural resources, booming economy, and strategic location in the region does not have a national security strategy, what can best explain its policy behaviour? The puzzle can be unravelled by a comprehensive analysis of dominant factors at the levels of the individual (i.e., the personality of leaders, their biases, and threat perceptions), institutions (i.e., political processes, bureaucratic constraints, and decision-making apparatuses), and society (i.e., culture, state-society relations, and historical experience). Understanding the complex interplay of causal factors and conditions at various levels of analysis can help explain the state of the nation, its defence posture, and its position in the region." [Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, "Explaining the Philippines' Defence Policy," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, 29 November 2017, https://theasiadialogue.com/2017/11/29/explaining-the-philippines-defence-policy/.]

[79] Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, "Role Conception and Conduct of Duterte's Security Policy," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, 31 January 2018, https://theasiadialogue.com/2018/01/31/role-conception-and-strategic-orientation-in-dutertes-philippine-security-policy/.

factor for Duterte's soft policy stance *vis-a-vis* China in the West Philippine Sea (WPS) dispute? How can the offence-defence theory in national and international security explain Duterte's preference for avoiding conflict with China, following the Recto Bank incident in June 2019? How can this structural realist theory of security illuminate key areas of debate on Philippine defense and foreign policy?"[80]

(2) Case study. Concerned about past occurrences, the case study approach essentially makes it an analysis OF policy. Case study can take the form of analysis of policy determination, which is what FPA is all about. However, unlike FPA, case study is not limited to examining decision-making processes and particular policy determinants. Case study can be more comprehensive when it tries to explain outcomes and impact of policy in a particular time and setting, using either an established theory or a grounded theory. To note, the latter refers to an original explanation based on empirical and/or experiential knowledge of a policy problem in a specific case. Grounded theory seeks to develop a new or alternative theory that can address research puzzles about peculiar conditions or novel situations.

As an analysis OF policy, the case study approach is not just a detailed documentation of what happened about a policy at some point in time. It is a theory-driven diagnosis of why and how certain policy or strategy was undertaken. Case study is a method of choice to identify sufficient and necessary causes of the success or failure of policy. Hence, it can examine policy with the end in view of drawing some lessons from the case, which may serve as inputs to policymaking. It is not the primary intention of a case study to recommend some measures to improve an ongoing policy, which is the concern of analysis FOR policy. Rather, the purpose of case study is to produce rich knowledge base of how theory plays out in real-life situations and/or how actual policy dynamics inspire theoretical innovation. Case study can also be extended to compare common and/or differentiated causal patterns in two or more cases. Comparative analysis allows us to understand better how certain condition(s) in a particular case, which were absent in another case, serve(s) as strong explanatory factor(s) for policy outcome(s).

For example, I wrote in 2017 an article with this title: *The Case of the Philippine Drug War: When the State Securitizes an Existential Threat to Public Safety.* Using this as primary reference, Ospina and Valentina's 2018 study compared Columbia's experience with the drug war in 2000 with that of the Philippines in 2016 to identify elements of securitization processes that were present in both countries and specific to each case.[81] Another example of comparative case study is that of Theros Wong's 2019 article with this title: *The Power of Ethnic Politics in Foreign Policy Making Decisions: A Comparison of Malaysia's Mahathir and the Philippines' Duterte on the Belt and Road Initiative.* Here, the author sought to explain how ethnic composition influenced Malaysia's rejection of China's belt and road initiative.[82] Compared with the Philippines, ethnicity is not a political issue and factor for foreign policymaking.

Notably, Cheng-Chwee Kuik's research studies on how small states in Southeast Asia hedge with China in common and/or contradictory ways can be regarded as quintessence of comparative FPA between and among countries that are roughly on the same level. In 2008, he wrote two seminal journal articles: (1) *Rising Dragon, Crouching Tigers: Comparing the Foreign Policy Responses of Malaysia and Singapore Toward*

[80] Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, "Fishing in Troubled Waters: Defense Stature as Explanatory Factor for Duterte's Stand in the West Philippine Sea," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, 16 August 2019, https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/08/16/fishing-in-troubled-waters-defense-stature-as-explanatory-factor-of-dutertes-stand-in-the-west-philippine-sea/.

[81] As Ospina and Valentina wrote in the abstract of their paper: "This research is based on Arlene Tickner's assertions about the securitization of the fight against illegal drugs in Colombia in 2000, and those of Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase on the securitization of the fight against illegal drugs in the Philippines in 2016, in order to compare these cases and identify the common and dissimilar elements, with the aim of distinguishing between the factors that are usually present in the securitization processes and those that are specific to each case." [Gomez Ospina and Laura Valentina, *Estudio comparado de la securitización de la lucha contra las drogas en Colombia y Filipinas*, (Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Political Science and International Relations of the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogota, D.C., 2018), https://repository.javeriana.edu.co/handle/10554/40083.]

[82] Theros Wong, "The Power of Ethnic Politics in Foreign Policy Making Decisions: A Comparison of Malaysia's Mahathir and the Philippines' Duterte on the Belt Road Initiative," *NYU Abu Dhabi Journal of Social Sciences* (October 2019),https://sites.nyuad.nyu.edu/jss/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/JSS_19_20_Submission_1-5.pdf.

a Re-Emerging China, 1990-2005,[83] which explained the variation of the two countries' China policies; and, (2) *The Essence of Hedging: Malaysia and Singapore's Response to a Rising China,*[84] which compared the two countries' hedging policies with those of Thailand and Indonesia. In 2016, Kuik further developed his grounded or middle-range theory of hedging behavior of other states in Southeast Asia in his study entitled *How Do Weaker States Hedge?: Unpacking ASEAN States' Alignment Behavior Toward China.*[85]

(3) Discourse analysis. This discursive, post-positivist approach to policy analysis offers critical insights as to how meanings are produced in the language of policy arguments. It examines how dominant interpretive dispositions are socially constructed—such that certain policy choices become possible and accepted.[86] It looks into the constitutive power of a policy communication, not really at the causal factors of policy decision. Hence, it is unlike the qualitative analysis of policy determination that explains the causes of effects, and the quantitative analysis of policy options that calculates effects of causes.[87]

Discourse analysis uses *nominalist* perspective[88] and *relativist* theory,[89] which are in contrast with realism and logical positivism of scientific research. Critical discourse analysis deconstructs the subject, its presuppositions, and its predicates in order to understand their linguistic construction and performativity. This qualitative approach is the substance of Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde's framework of analyzing security. Considering that securitization is socially constructed, the British scholars asserted that the way to study the subject is to analyze discourse as well as political constellations.[90]

For example, the proponents [i.e., Buzan et al.] of securitization theory articulated a generic research puzzle for discourse analysis: "When does an argument with this particular rhetorical and semiotic structure achieve sufficient effect to make an audience tolerate violations of rules that would otherwise have to be obeyed?"[91] An earlier study of policy discourse with the same logic of securitization was Roxanne Lynn Doty's 1993 article with this title: *Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines.* In her analysis of US interventionist policy in the Philippines post-independence, Doty had asked the following questions: "How, amidst all the profession of sovereign equality, did the post-colonial United States-Philippine relations come to be constructed in so hierarchical a manner that the U.S. was licensed to diagnose and judge the internal situation of the Philippines? How, indeed, did it come to be constructed such that, upon judging the situation, United States' policymakers could regard counterinsurgency measures as the only reasonable course of action?"[92]

---

[83] Cheng-Chwee Kuik, "Rising Dragon, Crouching Tigers: Comparing the Foreign Policy Responses of Malaysia and Singapore Toward a Re-Emerging China, 1990-2005," *Biblioasia* Vol. 3, Issue 4 (January 2008), https://biblioasia.nlb.gov.sg/past-issues/pdf/BiblioAsia%20Jan%202008.pdf.

[84] Cheng-Chwee Kuik, "The Essence of Hedging: Malaysia and Singapore's Response to a Rising China," *Contemporary Southeast Asia* Vol. 30, No. 2 (2008), pp. 159-185, https://muse.jhu.edu/article/256501.

[85] Cheng-Chwee Kuik, "How Do Weaker States Hedge?: Unpacking ASEAN States' Alignment Behavior Toward China," *Journal of Contemporary China* Vol. 25, No. 100 (2016), https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296689375_How_Do_Weaker_States_Hedge_Unpacking_ASEAN_states%27_alignment_behavior_towards_China.

[86] See discussions on the discursive practices of post-positivist foreign policy analysis in Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines," *International Studies Quarterly* No. 37 (1993), pp. 302-305, https://www.jstor.org/stable/2600810?seq=1.

[87] James Mahoney and Gary Goertz, "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research," *Political Analysis* No. 14 (2006), p. 229, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31457595_A_Tale_of_Two_Cultures_Contrasting_Quantitative_and_Qualitative_Research.

[88] *Nominalism* is a subjective view of reality, which Burrell and Morgan defined as a "position (that) revolves around the assumption that the social world external to individual cognition is made of nothing more than names, concepts and labels which are used to structure reality." Further, the authors wrote the following: "The nominalist does not admit to there being any 'real' structure to the world which these concepts are used to describe. The 'names' used are regarded as artificial creations whose utility is based upon their convenience as tools describing, making sense of and negotiating the external world." [Burrel and Morgan, p. 4.]

[89] *Relativism* refers to subjective grounds of knowledge based on one's perceptions of social realities. As Burrell and Morgan wrote: "For the anti-positivist, the social world is essentially relativistic and can only be understood by occupying the frame of reference of the individuals who are directly involved in the activities which are to be studied."[Ibid., p. 5.]

[90] Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde, p. 25

[91] Ibid.

[92] Doty, pp. 297-298.

Another example of discourse analysis is my 2018 article with this title: *Strategic Ambiguity: Deconstructing Duterte's National Security Strategy.* The questions I asked in this thought-piece are as follows: "How did President Duterte, with his well-known rhetorical fierceness and revolutionary foreign policy, shape the security discourse in the Philippines' first National Security Strategy (NSS) publication in 2018? How were the focal subjects [i.e., referents that need to be protected against existential threats] predicated and positioned in relation to one another in the discursive practice in the NSS? What were the explicit or implicit presuppositions, which make possible the policy preferences and strategic direction of President Duterte in his NSS?" As I wrote in this article, deconstruction—which is a critical analysis of language and semantics—can unravel conceptual nuances and incongruences in policy communication. By closely examining relations between text and meaning, we are able to see the underlying logic (or the lack of it) in the substance and structure of policy argumentation.[93] Mastery of the discursive approach allows us not only to see some theoretical instabilities in the content of policy, but also to avoid these in constructing our own arguments.

(4) Other analytical perspectives [e.g., historical and sociological]. Aside from the three approaches discussed under the analysis OF policy, there are other analytical perspectives used by social scientists that focus on cultural, sociological, and/or historical factors to explain domestic and foreign policies.[94] As I wrote in my 2007 analysis of presidential speeches in the Philippines from 1935-2006, the historical approach to policy studies can help scholars understand why certain issues dominated the public agenda in particular periods of administration; what choices in policies were made in response to the demands of the time; what arguments were used to justify the legitimacy of new policies; why some old practices or ideas managed to survive in the passing of time; or why decision-makers as well as citizens simply want to break away from the past.[95] The answers to these research queries offer alternative frames of examining policy shifts in public administration, which can also be applied in national security affairs.

Other studies that use sociological theories challenge prevailing beliefs about certain policy actions as well as inaction in the past. They problematize dominant theories that fail to explain, for example, why some states did not behave the way realists would expect them to do, given some pressures in the systemic environment. In the process, sociological studies introduce critical conceptual tools that were previously unexplored or neglected in the mainstream literature of International Relations or National Security Studies. On the whole, constructivist policy studies that use historical and sociological perspectives help us clarify theoretical controversies, comprehend complex settings, and understand puzzling state behavior in national security affairs.

A perfect example of a sociological perspective of national security policy is the 1996 book with this title: *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. In the introduction, Peter Katzenstein argued that culture, which is oftentimes neglected in major theories of the field, shapes national interest and foreign policy. In this light, the collection of research studies in his edited book focused on cultural factors—such as national values and identity—to explain national security policies. Katzenstein presented some examples of research puzzles pondered on by the authors in the book: "In the absence of geostrategic or economic stakes, why do the interests of some powerful states in the 1990s, but not in the 1930s or the 1890s, make them intervene militarily to protect the lives and welfare of citizens other than their own? Why did the Soviet Union consider it to be in its interest to withdraw from Eastern Europe in the late stages of the Cold War, while it had rejected such suggestions many times before?"[96]

[93] See Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, "Strategic Ambiguity: Deconstructing Duterte's National Security Strategy," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, 1 October 2018, https://theasiadialogue.com/2018/10/01/strategic-ambiguity-deconstructing-dutertes-2018-national-security-strategy/.

[94] For Dror, public policy is a process system that is embedded in the socio-cultural and historical practices of a people in an environment that is characterized by constant changes and conflict. [See Yehezkel Dror, *Policymaking Under Adversity* (New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Books, 1986).]

[93] The discursive approach to administrative history was discussed in the introduction of the 2007 dissertation on the analysis of the State of the Nation Addresses (SONAs) and other speeches of Philippines Presidents, 1935-2006. [Almase, 2007, p. 4.]

[96] See Peter J. Katzenstein, "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security," in *The Culture of National Security: Norms and*

In another example, I analyzed in 2018 President Duterte's independent foreign policy away from the US, using a theory of state-society relations from the marginal literature of FPA. The theoretical assumption is that less developed states are not capable of asserting foreign policy autonomy. This is particularly true for the Philippines as a former colony whose independence had been granted by the US after the Second World War, and whose sovereignty has been continuously guaranteed by the United Nations (UN). To note, the rules-based order in international relations, which gives some sense of security to small and weak states like the Philippines, is sponsored and guaranteed by the US and other powerful countries in the West. With this backdrop, I then asked the following questions about Duterte's assertion of an independent and revisionist foreign policy in 2016: "Is autonomous decision-making on matters of the state likely, given the realities of internal political disputes, external economic dependency, fractured administrative machinery, and a weak military in the Philippines? How do these conditions explain its policy behaviour and relations with its internal and external environments? From a historical-sociological perspective, how do we make sense of an independent foreign policy rhetoric by President Duterte?"[97]

The foregoing articles cited under the section on analysis OF policy are just few examples of the varieties of qualitative approaches to national security policy analysis. It must be noted that the labels I used to denote various analytical methods in this paper are not really mutually exclusive or very different from each other. This is because policy analysis does not always fall under a single, categorical label that can be easily distinguished from other approaches. For example, my 2019 article—entitled *Small State Security Syndrome: Understanding the Philippines' National Security Strategy*—could be identified as analysis of policy determination, case study, discourse analysis, and/or alternative perspective on national security policy. In this article, I argued that the conspicuous exclusion of the Philippines from the list of small states is a conceptual controversy that must be resolved if the small states category has to have any value in policy analysis. My research queries are as follows: "Is the Philippines—an archipelago with 7,640 islands, 107 million population, and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of US $354 billion growing at an average annual rate of 6.5%—a small state or not in the region's security landscape? How do the country's security mentality and policy, as articulated in its NSS, reveal its political size and perceptual weight in the strategic domain? How does the small state security syndrome manifest in the policy choices and strategic approaches of the Philippines on real matters of national security?"[98]

Analysis OF policy, especially FPA, can also be multi-level, an example of which is the analytical framework I used in the 2020 article entitled *Duterte's Gambit: How the Two-Level Game Theory Explains the Odds of Terminating the US Visiting Forces Agreement.* The research questions in this article sought to generate theoretically substantive discussions on the politics and dynamics of negotiating a defense agreement at international and domestic levels. Specifically, the academic inquiries are as follows: "What value judgement and conception of the national interest prompted President Duterte to send the Philippines' 180-day notice of VFA termination and to suspend it after 112 days? To what extent could his rational egoism abrogate the VFA or accommodate concessions to extend it? What determines the possible deal and no-deal sets for the Philippines and the US on the VFA or a similar arrangement for visiting American forces in this host country in the future?"[99] As I wrote here, Putnam's game theoretical model in FPA is key to understanding the extent and/or limits of Duterte's bargaining range at the strategic level. It is for this reason that I used the logic of Putnam's two-level games as a *pluralist approach*[100] to analyze Duterte's policy gambit of breaking it off with the US, and

Identity in World Politics ed. by Peter J. Katzenstein (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

[97] See Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, "Reinterpreting Duterte's Independent Foreign Policy Rhetoric," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, 29 March 2018, https://theasiadialogue.com/2018/03/29/reinterpreting-dutertes-independent-foreign-policy-rhetoric/.

[98] See Ananda Devi Domingo-Almase, "Small State Security Syndrome: Understanding the Philippines' National Security Strategy," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, 19 February 2019, https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/02/19/the-long-read-small-state-security-syndrome-understanding-the-philippines-national-security-strategy/.

[99] Almase, 2020, p. 4.

[100] As I wrote in the 2020 article entitled *Duterte's Gambit: How the Two-Level Game Theory Explains the Odds of Terminating the US Visiting Forces Agreement*: "A holistic, *pluralist approach* in FPA aims to explore significant drivers of state behavior from various sources of explanation. Aside from looking at the political and economic relations at the strategic level, FPA scholars also look into individual and group decision-making processes to understand reasons, motivations, and even emotions behind the policy output. They unpack the black box of policy-making to examine how and why decisionmakers arrived at a negotiated policy outcome. It must be noted that when presumably

the odds of gaining some compensating advantage from such a risky move. Multi-level analysis helps clarify Duterte's staunch position, as well as unpack complex and simultaneous political games in which policy bets are made and negotiated by multiple players.

Table 3. General Guidelines and Logical Procedures in Writing an Analysis OF Policy in the Academia
1. Identify a critical national security policy or goal-oriented strategy to analyze or explain.
2. Determine subject area and method of analysis by reviewing previous academic studies.
3. Craft theory-based and method-driven research puzzle(s) that can shed light on a policy decision in question [e.g., foreign policy change and securitization of previously non-securitized problem].
4. With reference to the foregoing, conceptualize and frame the research problem using coherent theoretical perspective/model.
5. Analyze the policy problem and address the research questions according to the rigor and procedure of the preferred method of analysis.
6. Provide critical and comprehensive explanation for policy decision or policy determination, which can help in theory and policy development.

Summary

In the first part of the paper, I introduced the critical importance of studying policy analysis and applying this correctly in the field of national security. I articulated epistemic issues that seek to place national security policy analysis in proper focus. Particularly, I asked why policy analysis should be the centerpiece of National Security Studies, especially in the National Defense College of the Philippines or NDCP; what the nature of national security policy analysis is, compared with what I called normal public policy analysis; how a nuanced understanding of these two fields of policy analysis helps examine decisions and options for national security; and, what appropriate methods of national security policy analysis can be used by analysts in academic and policy circles. The comprehensive answers to these areas of inquiry were presented in three, stand-alone thought pieces following the introduction of the paper. With this, I will only highlight in this summary the topics that were expounded in this study.

In the second part of the paper, I discussed the grounds of knowledge as to why policy analysis is and should always be at the heart of National Security Studies. There are three subtopics to support this argument: First is the policy-oriented definition of national security. Second is the extraordinary policy that national security invokes. And third is the rationale for National Security Studies, that is, to analyze policy choices that states make to survive in an insecure world. As I emphasized at the end of this part, National Security Studies is basically concerned about policy analysis: from problem structuring, agenda setting and decision-making; to implementing, monitoring and recalibrating policy for national security. Academics, decision-makers, and practitioners in defense and security communities will always be preoccupied with policy analysis to

rational actors take certain courses of action, they do not just rely on their calculations of hard facts in the real world, but also on their perceptions of realities in the cognitive realm." [Ibid., p. 7].

determine and understand what the nature of threat is, what national interests are at stake, when a problem becomes a security issue, and how the latter can be justified as urgent in the executive agenda. With this, I argued that policy analysis is indisputably the be-all and end-all of a national security education, especially in NDCP.

In the third part of the paper, I outlined key concepts and characteristics of policy analysis as they apply to public administration on the one hand, and to national security affairs on the other. Using a comparative table, I brought to light shared, nuanced, and differentiated areas of concern between normal public policy analysis and national security policy analysis. The comparison of their basic constructs draws our attention to the unique identity of policy analysis in the strategic domain of international politics and national security. As I presented in *Table 1*, the following are the fundamentals that distinguish policy analysis in national security affairs from policy analysis under regular conditions of public administration: (1) subjects of analysis; (2) paradigms and frameworks of analysis; (3) nature of the policy problem; (4) assumptions about the policy environment; (5) nature of politics in policy-making; (6) key policy actors; (7) value preferences; (8) purposes and functions of policy; (9) purposes and functions of policy analysis; (10) policy models; (11) levels of analysis; and, (12) kinds and methods of policy analysis. Only when the basic constructs of national security policy analysis are contrasted with those of normal public policy analysis can we begin to understand what national security policy analysis is really all about and how to do this right in national security administration.

In the fourth and last part of the paper, I identified and defined the methods of analyzing national security policy choices. A comprehension of the quantitative and qualitative research paradigms is the starting point of a student's journey to the academic realm of policy analysis. Along this line, I accentuated the need to articulate intelligent questions that are informed by the theoretical principles and parameters of particular paradigm(s). This way, the intellectual coherence of policy analysis is ensured in the process of inquiry—whether in writing a thesis or a policy paper for different readers and recipients. Moreover, I emphasized that there are two kinds of policy analysis as to purpose: (1) analysis FOR policy, which evaluates policy options and recommends a best course of action; and (2) analysis OF policy, which explains the reasons behind a policy decision. Each kind of policy analysis has its own methods or approaches to frame policy problems and address key questions about those problems. Under the analysis FOR policy, I selected three methods that can be used by researchers and analysts in defense and security communities: (1) strategic evaluation, which is a qualitative analysis; (2) systems analysis, which is a mix of quantitative and qualitative analyses; and, (3) operations research, which is quantitative. Under the analysis OF policy, I came up with four generic, qualitative approaches used in the academia: (1) analysis of policy determination, which is foreign policy analysis or FPA in International Relations; (2) case study, which can be single or comparative; (3) discourse analysis, which is a critique of the rhetorical structure and substance of policy argumentation; and, (4) other analytical perspectives, which use sociological theories, historical insights, multi-level analysis, and/or combined approaches from the qualitative paradigm. I provided samples of research puzzles or questions to further clarify the methods and approaches that can be used by students and professionals in our field. I also added general guidelines and logical procedures for conducting an analysis FOR policy in national security administration, and also for writing an analysis OF policy in the academia.

Thus far, I would like to end this paper with what I asserted in the beginning: The quality of policy debates and choices will not be compromised when we have proper knowledge to advance coherent arguments. Learning best the theories and methods of national security policy analysis is essential to good analysis and better policy. This is also central to develop and enrich the field of study in NDCP.

Reference List

Alden, Chris and Amnon Aran. 2012. *Foreign Policy Analysis: New Approaches*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Almase, Ananda Devi Domingo. 2020. "Duterte's Gambit: How the Two-Level Game Theory Explains the Odds of Terminating the US Visiting Forces Agreement." *NDCP Faculty Paper No. 1* (July). ISSN: 2719-0773. http://www.ndcp.edu.ph/TRANSPARENCY%20-%20PDF%20FILES/Faculty%20Paper/NDCP%20Faculty%20Paper%20(Online%20Copy)%2005022021%20v2.pdf.

_____. 2020. "NSA 203: National Security Policy Analysis Syllabus." National Defense College of the Philippines, Camp Aguinaldo, Quezon City.

_____. 2019. "Fishing in Troubled Waters: Defense Stature as Explanatory Factor of Duterte's Stand in the West Philippine Sea." *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue,* August 16. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/08/16/fishing-in-troubled-waters-defense-stature-as-explanatory-factor-of-dutertes-stand-in-the-west-philippine-sea/.

_____. 2019. "Small State Security Syndrome: Understanding the Philippines' National Security Strategy." *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, February 19. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/02/19/the-long-read-small-state-security-syndrome-understanding-the-philippines-national-security-strategy/.

_____. 2018. "Strategic Ambiguity: Deconstructing Duterte's 2018 National Security Strategy." *University of Nottingham Asia Dialogue*, October 1. https://theasiadialogue.com/2018/10/01/strategic-ambiguity-deconstructing-dutertes-2018-national-security-strategy/.

_____. 2018. "Reinterpreting Duterte's Independent Foreign Policy Rhetoric." *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, March 29. https://theasiadialogue.com/2018/03/29/reinterpreting-dutertes-independent-foreign-policy-rhetoric/.

_____. 2018. "Role Conception and Conduct of Duterte's Security Policy," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue,* January 31. https://theasiadialogue.com/2018/01/31/role-conception-and-strategic-orientation-in-dutertes-philippine-security-policy/.

_____. 2017. "Explaining the Philippines' Defence Policy," *University of Nottingham's Asia Dialogue*, November 29. https://theasiadialogue.com/2017/11/29/explaining-the-philippines-defence-policy/.

_____. 2017. "The Case of the Philippine Drug War: When the State Securitizes an Existential Threat to Public Safety." *University of Nottingham Asia Dialogue Dialogue*, September 5. https://theasiadialogue.com/2017/06/01/the-case-of-the-philippine-drug-war-when-the-state-securitizes-an-existential-threat-to-public-safety/.

_____. 2016. "From Policy to Strategy: The Quest for a Real National Security Strategy in the Philippines." *Philippine Public Safety Review* Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 15-57.

_____. 2013. "What the Subject of Security Really Means: A Look into the Content and Context of the 2011-2016 National Security Policy Analysis in the Philippines." *National Security Review*, pp. 84-106.

_____. 2007. "Authoritarian Administration and the Campaign for Democratic Revolution for National Security and Social Equity, 1971-1985." *A Saga of Administrative Thought in Presidential Rhetoric: Analysis of the State of the Nation Addresses and Speeches of Philippines Presidents, 1935-2006.* Dissertation submitted to the National College of Public Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines (UP), Diliman, Quezon City.

Bartels, Elizabeth M. 2020. *Building Better Games for National Security Policy Analysis: Towards a Social Scientific Approach*. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD437.html.

Baylis, John, James J. Wirtz, and Colin Gray. 2010. *Strategy in the Contemporary World* Third Edition. Oxford, England: University of Oxford Press.

Burrell, Gibson and Gareth Morgan. 2005. "In Search of a Framework: Assumptions about the Nature of Social Science." *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Buzan, Barry and Ole Wæver. 2003. "Security Complexes: A Theory of Regional Security." *Regions and Powers*: *The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, Barry ,Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security*: *A New Framework of Analysis.* Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Caldwell, Dan and Robert E. Williams, Jr. 2016. *Seeking Security in an Insecure World* Third Edition. London, UK: Rowman and Littlefield.

Creswell, John W. 2014. *Research Design*: *Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

De Guzman, Raul P. 1993. "Is There a Philippine Public Administration?" *Introduction to Public Administration: A Reader* ed. by Victoria A. Bautista et al. Diliman, Quezon City: UP Press and UP College of Public Administration.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn. 1993. "Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines." *International Studies Quarterly* No. 37. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2600810?seq=1.

Drachman, Edward, Allan Shank, Karla J. Cunningham and Jeremy Grace. 2003. *You Decide! Controversial Global Issues*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Dror, Yehezkel. 1986. *Policymaking Under Adversity*. New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Books.

Dunn, William N. 2012. *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction* Fifth Edition. New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education Inc.

Dye, Thomas R. 1976. *What Governments Do, Why They Do It, and What Difference it Makes*. Alabama, USA: University of Alabama Press.

Gordon, Lewis, and Young. 1993. "Perspectives on policy analysis." *The Policy Process: A Reader* ed. by Michael Hill. Great Britain: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Jones, Charles. 2014. *International Relations: A Beginner's Guide*. London, England: Oneworld Publications.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1996. "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security." *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* ed. by Peter J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kugler, Richard L. 2006. *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs: New Methods for a New Era*. Washington,DC, USA: Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University.

Kuik, Cheng-Chwee. 2016. "How Do Weaker States Hedge?: Unpacking ASEAN States' Alignment Behavior Toward China." *Journal of Contemporary China* Vol. 25, No. 100. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296689375_How_Do_Weaker_States_Hedge_Unpacking_ASEAN_states%27_alignment_behavior_towards_China.

_____. 2008. "The Essence of Hedging: Malaysia and Singapore's Response to a Rising China." *Contemporary Southeast Asia* Vol. 30, No. 2. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/256501.

_____. 2008. "Rising Dragon, Crouching Tigers: Comparing the Foreign Policy Responses of Malaysia and Singapore Toward a Re-Emerging China, 1990-2005." *Biblioasia* Vol. 3, Issue 4 (January). https://biblioasia.nlb.gov.sg/past-issues/pdf/BiblioAsia%20Jan%202008.pdf.

Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis* No. 14. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31457595_A_Tale_of_Two_Cultures_Contrasting_Quantitative_and_Qualitative_Research.

Mingst Karen A. and Ivan M. Arreguin-Toft. 2011. *Essentials of International Relations* 5th Edition. New York, USA: Norton, W.W. & Company, Inc.

Minogue, Martin. 1983. "Theory and Practice in Public Policy Administration." *Policy and Politics* Vol. 11, No. 1.

Mueller, Dennis C. 2004. "Public Choice: An Introduction." *The Encyclopedia of Public Choice* Vol. 1 ed. by Charles K. Rowley and Friedrich Schneider. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Ospina, Gomez and Laura Valentina. 2018. *Estudio comparado de la securitización de la lucha contra las drogas en Colombia y Filipinas.* Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Political Science and International Relations of the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogota, D.C. https://repository.javeriana.edu.co/handle/10554/40083.

Patton, Carl V., David S. Sawicki & Jennifer E. Clark. 2013. *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning* Third Edition. New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education Inc.

Stolberg, Allan G. 2012. "Making National Security Policy in the 21st Century." *US Army War College Guide to National Security Issues Volume II: National Security Policy and Strategy* ed. by J. Boone Bartholomees, Jr.. Pennsylvania, USA: US Army War College, pp. 41-61. https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=715236.

United Nations Development Programme. 1994. *Human Development Report* 1994. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

U.S. National Intelligence Council. 2004. *Mapping the Global Future: Report of the National Intelligence Council's 2020 Project*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Government Printing Office. https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Global%20Trends_Mapping%20the%20Global%20Future%202020%20Project.pdf.

Walt, Stephen M. 1991. "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* Vol 35, No. 2.

Wong, Theros. 2019. "The Power of Ethnic Politics in Foreign Policy Making Decisions: A Comparison of Malaysia's Mahathir and the Philippines' Duterte on the Belt Road Initiative." *NYU Abu Dhabi Journal of Social Sciences* (October). https://sites.nyuad.nyu.edu/jss/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/JSS_19_20_Submission_1-5.pdf.

NATIONAL DEFENSE COLLEGE OF THE PHILIPPINES

FACULTY PAPER

The NDCP Faculty Paper is published bi-annually by the National Defense College of the Philippines.

BGEN ARCHIMEDES H VIAJE AFP (Ret), PhD, CESE, MNSA
President, National Defense College of the Philippines

PROF DR JOSE SANTOS R CARANDANG IV, MNSA
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean

CDR ROSTUM J BAUTISTA, PN (Res), MNSA
Chief, Academic Affairs Division

PATRICIA LEE T YANGA
Layout Artist