

NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

Class Meetings: Tuesdays 4:10-6:00
Office hours: Wednesdays 2:30-5:00
(except when conflicting meetings
require rescheduling) or by
appointment.

Professor Richard K. Betts
Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies
Room 1328, International Affairs Building
212-854-7325
rkb4@columbia.edu

Substance and process of current U.S. national security policy in historical and philosophical perspective, focusing on questions about values, the role of military power, overt and covert foreign intervention, terrorism, civil-military relations, legislative-executive relations, organizational behavior and bureaucratic politics, leadership and psychological influences on decision and implementation, intelligence, and wartime policymaking.

Requirements: For background, general knowledge of the history of U.S. foreign policy in the past century, and specific knowledge of current events on the level of careful daily reading of news sections of the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, or *Wall Street Journal* is assumed. If admitted to the class you must: (1) attend class sessions (students are allowed one absence, after which any absence for reasons short of a matter of life and death will be penalized); (2) faithfully complete *all* assigned readings *before* class sessions in which they are discussed (preparation will be probed and unprepared students will be penalized); (3) participate sensibly in those discussions (students who seldom contribute, or who blather ceaselessly, will be penalized); (4) write two five-page papers (strict limit of 1,500 words each) on topics from a range of options assigned by the instructor (see pp. 6-7 below), due *at the beginning of the class* (NLT 4:10) on the due date (**NB: Late five-page papers will not be accepted,**¹ since they are meant to prepare you for discussions that day--if you do not finish one in time, you must junk it and do one of the later options); (5) submit a research proposal, adhering strictly to the format dictated on p. 11 of this syllabus, by Tuesday, October 18 for a 15-20 page paper (strict limit of 6,500 words) on a topic of your own choice; (6) research and write the proposed paper and submit it by noon, Tuesday, December 13. Research papers on topics not approved by the instructor will not be accepted. **For the five-page papers, one must be from among options 1-5 and the other from options 6-10.** All papers for the course must be double-spaced, in at least 12-point type with one-inch margins. For the long paper, the instructor is happy to take the time to provide comments, except for students who do not care whether they get them. *If you want written comments you must provide a self-addressed 9x12 return envelope* (postage not necessary). All must write mailing address, phone number, and e-mail address on the first page of the paper. *Approximately* one tenth of the course grade will be based on each of the five-page papers, one-tenth on the research paper proposal, one half on the 15-20 page paper, and one fifth on performance in class discussions.

Warning: Because this is not a lecture course in which you can make up for procrastination by cramming at the end, but a seminar in which discussions' success depends on students' thorough preparation, *those who do not commit themselves to read carefully a demanding amount of material, to do so on time for each meeting, and to honor all requirements, may not enroll in this course.*

¹ Exception: Those who fail to submit the first paper by October 10, or the second paper by November 21, must submit the missed paper late and receive a penalty of one full grade, or more than one grade if the paper is not submitted within one week of the original due date.

When possible, read assigned items in the order in which they are listed.

I. **Introduction**

September 12

Stephen Peter Rosen, "An Empire, if You Can Keep It," *The National Interest*, No. 71 (Spring 2003)

Lee Feinstein and Anne-Marie Slaughter, "A Duty to Prevent," *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 1 (January/February 2004)

Barry R. Posen, "The Case for Restraint," *The American Interest* 3, no. 2 (November/December 2007)²

Stephen Sestanovich, *Maximalist: America in the World from Truman to Obama* (Knopf, 2014), Prologue

Walter Russell Mead, "The Return of Geopolitics" and G. John Ikenberry,, "The Illusion of Geopolitics," both in *Foreign Affairs* 93, no. 3 (May/June 2014)

II. **Ideals and Interests**

September 19

George Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (University of Chicago Press, 1951), chaps.1-6

Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (Harcourt, Brace, 1955), chap. 11

Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence* (Knopf, 2002), chaps. 1, 2, 7

John D. Steinbruner, *Principles of Global Security* (Brookings Institution Press, 2000), chap. 1

Eliot Cohen, "The 'Kind of Thing' Crisis," *American Interest* 10, no. 3 (January/February 2015)

John J. Mearsheimer, "Why the Ukraine Crisis is the West's Fault," *Foreign Affairs* 93, no. 5 (September/October 2014)

III. **Primacy or Overreach?**

September 26

Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (Random House, 1987), Introduction, pp. 514-535, and Epilogue

Barry P. Bosworth and Robert Z. Lawrence, "America's Global Role: From Dominance to Interdependence," in John D. Steinbruner, ed., *Restructuring American Foreign Policy* (Brookings Institution, 1989)

Jim Manzi, "Keeping America's Edge," *National Affairs*, No. 2 (Winter 2010)

William C. Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World," *International Security* 24, no. 1 (Summer 1999)

Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment," *International Security* 31, no. 2 (Fall 2006)

² For those interested in the fully developed form of Posen's argument see his book, *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

IV. **Regional Case: The USA and China**

October 3

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Power and Interdependence," in Richard K. Betts, ed., *Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War and Peace*, 4th Edition (Pearson-Longman, 2008)

Robert Gilpin, "Hegemonic War and International Change," in Betts, ed., *Conflict After the Cold War*

G. John Ikenberry, "The Rise of China and the Future of the West," *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 1 (January/February 2008)

John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 2d Edition (Norton, 2014), chapter 10 ("Can China Rise Peacefully?")

Optional November 2-3 Election Break Reading: Richard K. Betts, *American Force: Dangers, Delusions, and Dilemmas in National Security* (Columbia University Press, 2012), chap. 8

V. **Military Power I: Missions and Priorities**

October 10

Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* 21, no. 3 (Winter 1996/97)

Eric A. Nordlinger, *Isolationism Reconfigured* (Princeton University Press, 1995), chaps. 1-3.

Steinbruner, *Principles of Global Security*, chap. 4

Sestanovich, *Maximalist*, chaps. 11-12

Optional Thanksgiving Vacation Reading: Betts, *American Force*, chaps. 1, 3, 6, 10-12

VI. **Unconventional Threats**

October 17

The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (W.W. Norton, n.d. [2004]), chap. 11

Richard A. Posner, "The 9/11 Report: A Dissent," *New York Times Book Review*, August 29, 2004

John Mueller, *Overblown: How Politicians and the Terrorism Industry Inflate National Security Threats, and Why We Believe Them* (Free Press, 2006), Introduction and chap. 1

P.W. Singer and Allan Friedman, *Cybersecurity and Cyberwar* (Oxford University Press, 2014), Part II (pp. 67-165)

Optional Christmas Vacation Reading: Betts, *American Force*, chap. 5



Research Paper Proposals Due Tuesday, October 18

VII. *Political Intervention*

October 24

Jon Western and Joshua S. Goldstein, "Humanitarian Intervention Comes of Age" and Benjamin A. Valentino, "The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention," both in *Foreign Affairs* 90, no. 6 (November/December 2011)

Morton H. Halperin, "Guaranteeing Democracy," *Foreign Policy* No. 91 (Summer 1993)

U.S. Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, Staff Report: *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975

Samuel P. Huntington, "Human Rights and American Power," *Commentary* 72, no. 3 (September 1981)

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (Simon and Schuster, 1996), chap. 12

VIII. *Constitutional Constraints on Policymaking*

October 31

Louis Henkin, *Constitutionalism, Democracy, and Foreign Affairs* (Columbia University Press, 1990), chap. 3

David Fagelson, "The Constitution and National Security: Covert Action in the Age of Intelligence Oversight," *Journal of Law and Politics* 5, no. 2 (Winter 1989)

The War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148, H.J. Res.542, 87 Stat. 555, November 7, 1973)

Louis Fisher, *Presidential War Power*, 3d Edition (University Press of Kansas, 2013), chaps. 6, 9, 10

IX. *Organizational Complexity and Political Control*

November 14

Charles E. Lindblom, "The Science of 'Muddling Through'," *Public Administration Review* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1959)

Graham T. Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *American Political Science Review* 63, no. 3 (September 1969)³

Stephen D. Krasner, "Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison Wonderland)," *Foreign Policy* No. 7 (Summer 1972)

³ Allison produced a more detailed book in 1971, updated and revised in 1999. In years after Allison's original research a few examples he used, based on interviews, were found to be inaccurate. The article is assigned here for its brevity, and as a survey of organizational and political impediments to rational decision and implementation, not as a fully accurate account of events in the missile crisis. If you wish, you may read the full version of the theory and case study instead of the 1969 article: Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Second Edition (Longman, 1999). See also Ernest R. May and Philip D. Zelikow, eds., *The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the White House During the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Harvard University Press, 1997) or Sheldon M. Stern, *Averting the "Final Failure": John F. Kennedy and the Secret Cuban Missile Crisis Meetings* (Stanford University Press, 2003).

Edward Wilson, "Thank You, Vasili Arkhipov, the Man Who Stopped Nuclear War," *theguardian.com*, October 27, 2012

Morton H. Halperin and Priscilla Clapp, with Arnold Kanter, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*, Second Edition (Brookings Institution Press, 2006), chaps. 3, 5, 7, 13-15

X. ***Leadership: Psychology, Beliefs, and Action***

November 21

Alexander L. George and Juliette L. George, *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House* (Dover, 1964), chaps. 1, 2, 11

Edwin A. Weinstein, James William Anderson, and Arthur S. Link, "Woodrow Wilson's Political Personality: A Reappraisal," *Political Science Quarterly* 93, no. 4 (Winter 1978-79)

John Steinbruner, *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision* (Princeton University Press, 1974), chaps. 1, 3, 4

Daniel Kahneman, *Thinking Fast and Slow* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011), chaps. 1, 7, 8, 13, 19, 20 and Appendix A.

XI. ***Military Power II: Civil-Military Relations***

November 28

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State* (Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 80-97, 143-157, 189-192

Eliot A. Cohen, *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime* (Free Press, 2002), chaps. 1, 7

Peter D. Feaver and Richard Kohn, "The Gap: Soldiers, Civilians and their Mutual Misunderstanding," *National Interest* No.61 (Fall 2000)

Colin L. Powell with Joseph Persico, *My American Journey* (Random House, 1995), pp. 558-586

Optional Intersession Vacation Reading: Richard K. Betts, *Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises*, 2d Edition (Columbia University Press, 1991);
Betts, *American Force*, chap. 9.

XII. ***Intelligence: Knowledge, Policy, and Politics***

December 5

Halperin and Clapp with Kanter, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*, chaps. 8, 9

Richard K. Betts, "Two Faces of Intelligence Failure: September 11 and Iraq's Missing WMD," *Political Science Quarterly* 122, no. 4 (Winter 2007-08)

U.S. House of Representatives, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, *Iran: Evaluation of U.S. Intelligence Performance Prior to November 1978*, Staff Report, January 1979.

John Horton, "Mexico, The Way of Iran?" *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 1, no. 2 (1986)

Nigel Inkster, "The Snowden Revelations: Myths and Misapprehensions," *Survival* 56, no. 1 (February-March 2014)

Optional Spring Vacation Reading: Richard K. Betts, *Enemies of Intelligence: Knowledge and Power in National Security* (Columbia University Press, 2007).

XIII. ***Military Power III: How Do Policymakers Overreach or Get It Right?***

December 12

Sestanovich, *Maximalist*, chaps. 4, 7

James C. Thomson, "How Could Vietnam Happen? An Autopsy," *Atlantic Monthly* (April 1968)

George Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (Knopf, 1998), pp. 488-492

Stephen Biddle, "Afghanistan's Legacy: Emerging Lessons of an Ongoing War," *Washington Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (Summer 2014)

Optional Summer Beach Reading: Leslie H. Gelb with Richard K. Betts, *The Irony of Vietnam* (Brookings Institution, 1979); Richard K. Betts, "Blowtorch Bob in Baghdad," *The American Interest* 1, no. 4 (Summer 2006); Betts, *American Force*, chap. 7.

Short Paper Options

Write on two questions. The reason for the prohibition on late papers is that their purpose is to stoke discussion in the relevant class session, and late papers cannot do that. Waiting to do the last option (November 20) will be dangerous, since no late paper will be accepted on that date without severe reduction in grade (and no late paper will be accepted under any conditions before the last two sessions), no matter whether a sudden case of malaria interferes with your writing the night before, your computer eats the draft, or a mugger takes it from you on your way to class. For all options until the last two on the list, if you start a paper but cannot finish in time to hand it in *before* class begins, you must junk it and do one of the subsequent choices. Papers may not be just summary descriptions of what others have said, or just statements of your own opinion. They must be interpretive and analytical, supporting arguments with evidence and logic by exploiting the relevant assigned readings. What do the readings imply for an answer, which of conflicting arguments are most relevant or persuasive, and what other issues should be involved in answering the question?

2. *Ideals and Interests* (September 19)

In what respects do the Ukraine crisis or other current issues in national security policy evoke the question of whether U.S. policy is or should be affected by American values?

3. *Primacy or Overreach?* (September 26)

For what reasons should American policymakers strive---or not---to maintain and exploit global primacy?

4. *Regional Case: The USA and China* (October 3)

Should the United States want China's economic growth and prosperity to continue?

5. *Military Power* (October 10)

Should the USA use force frequently for good purposes or seldom? What is the best case for the opposite answer? Why is that case still unconvincing?

6. *Unconventional Threats* (October 17)

Has the United States overreacted to the danger of terrorism? What is the best counterargument to your answer and why is it unconvincing?

7. *Political Intervention* (October 24)

"Whether U.S. intervention is secret or open does not matter; the ends rather than the means are what matter." Discuss.

9. *Organizational Complexity and Political Control* (November 14)

Do the structures and processes of government condemn national security policy to irrationality?

10. *Leadership* (November 21)

Do limitations of the human mind condemn decision-making to irrationality?

Advice on Research and Analytical Writing

For short papers on assigned topics, be sure that you (1) answer the question, and (2) make the best possible use of the appropriate readings to make your case. If points in readings apart from those assigned are especially relevant, use them, but do not neglect to exploit fully the assigned readings for the topic. What issues are implicit in the question, and how do the readings address them, either directly or by implication? If the readings point to different answers, which is more convincing, and why?

For these and any other papers you ever do, write clearly, directly, grammatically, and economically. Avoid cryptic or prolix constructions. Confusing prose indicates confused thought. You may find it helpful to read George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," which is reprinted in many collections, such as Peter Davison, ed., assisted by Angus and Sheila Davison, *The Complete Works of George Orwell*, vol. 17: *I Belong to the Left, 1945* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1998).

For the short papers, you may refer to the assigned readings by noting the author and page number in parentheses. Anything else cited, and all citations in the long research paper, must conform to normal academic citation conventions. If you have the slightest doubt about what they are, consult a reputable style manual, or look at footnote form in a university press book or political science journal, or look at the form used on this syllabus. *Do not*

confuse the form for citation in footnotes with that for bibliographies. You may use any of the three standard alternatives, but the instructor's first preference is footnotes, second is endnotes, and last is the convention of appending a bibliography and citing specific references with the author's name, date of publication, and page number in parentheses at the appropriate point in the text.

On all papers, but especially the long research paper, organize your analysis and presentation carefully. In the introduction, state clearly and concisely (1) what the question is that you are addressing; (2) why it is important; and (3) what your argument is. Make clear to the reader where you are going, but keep the introduction short. The conclusion to the paper should not simply repeat what you have said in summary form, but should weave together the strands in the body of the paper and show how the progression of the analysis leads to the two or three points that are the bottom line.

The bulk of the paper between the introduction and conclusion should marshal logic and evidence to test your hypothesis. Figure out what evidence is both relevant and available. This can be compilations of data on whatever phenomenon you are considering--for example, trends in defense budgets, or foreign aid to certain countries, or GDPs of countries in question, and so forth. Evidence can also come from case studies of comparable events in the past. For example, if you are investigating the effectiveness of military intervention, you might compare one or a few cases of success with one or a few of failure, and decide what similarities or differences among the cases best point to the most relevant conclusion. Keep the problem of researchability in mind as you choose a topic. Some interesting questions are only subject to speculation and intuition. You need to address a question that interests you, but which is also subject to analysis, that is, one on which historical evidence or current data can be brought to bear to suggest an answer beyond intuition. Addressing an issue prominent in the past (which will still have implications for present and future) is the easiest way to bring evidence to bear, especially solid documentary evidence. It is in your practical interest to take this to heart. *To emphasize: it will usually be easier to do a good job in a paper dealing with past cases rather than an issue of the immediate moment on which data are more limited.*

In framing your analysis, be sensitive to the question of how one would know whether what you believe is true or false. Does all the relevant evidence you have confirm your argument or lead to another conclusion? If the evidence is consistent with your explanation, is it consistent with different interpretations as well? Why are counterarguments to your position wrong or inadequate? Is there enough evidence available to reach a confident conclusion?

An original piece of research is not simple description, or simple assertion of opinion. It must involve some measure of theoretical description, explanation, or prediction. Theoretical description means identifying some *pattern* that clarifies understanding of a class of events. Explanation and prediction mean figuring out causes and effects--why did certain things happen (explanation), or how can observed patterns or causes give clues to what is likely to happen under particular circumstances in the future (prediction)? If you want to assert an opinion, fine, but support it with analysis of the sort just mentioned--that is, if you believe policy on issue "x" should be "y," show why the study of cases comparable to "x" demonstrates the logic of "y," rather than of "a," "b," or "c."

Keep in mind the distinction between interesting data and relevant data. That is, the evidence you cite must bear on the question you are asking.

As you take notes in the course of research in the library, do not forget to jot down the complete citation for the source, and the page number for each point. You will not want to have to waste time later going back to find them when you need to cite points from that source in the paper.

You may rely on secondary sources to support your analysis and supply evidence, and for certain subjects this may be the only feasible approach. Nevertheless, papers that utilize primary sources (documents, memoirs, interviews) will be especially well-regarded. You are not expected to travel outside New York to exploit primary sources available elsewhere, so unless you are exceptionally ambitious, you will probably be limited to using official documents in the Columbia library collections or on the Internet (but heed the reservations about the Internet noted below). The Senate and House committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Intelligence publish many useful reports and hearings transcripts on issues that they address. The *Foreign Relations of the United States* series published by the State Department (available right downstairs in Lehman Library) is the invaluable source of declassified documents for any area of U.S. policymaking up to the 1980s. The *Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense* (known informally as the "Posture Statement") contains official explanations of military force structure and programs. One easily accessible source of primary material is the Columbia library's Oral History Collection. There are numerous other official sources you can reach through the library or Internet. Reference librarians should be able to assist you in finding appropriate documentary collections.

A *partial* list of print periodicals likely to have useful articles for various topics in national security:

Academic Journals

International Security
Diplomatic History
Security Studies
Journal of Strategic Studies
Journal of Military History
Foreign Policy Analysis
Armed Forces and Society
Peacekeeping
International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence
Intelligence and National Security
International Organization
World Politics
International Studies Quarterly

Journals of Commentary and Opinion

Foreign Affairs
The National Interest
The American Interest
Survival
Washington Quarterly
Foreign Policy
Orbis
Commentary
World Policy Journal
World Affairs

Specialized Professional and Trade Journals

Naval War College Review
U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings
Parameters: Journal of the Army War College
Military Review
Army
Air University Review [to 1988]
Airpower Journal [after 1988]
JFQ: Joint Force Quarterly
Foreign Service Journal
Armed Forces Journal International
Defense Week
Defense News
Inside the Pentagon
Jane's Defense Weekly
Studies in Intelligence [unclassified issues]

Obviously much valuable material can be obtained on the Internet. Do not, however, indulge in the slothful mistake which is now unfortunately common among students of browsing the Internet as a *substitute* for library research. Most of the material on the Internet is recent; only ignoramuses believe that "old" sources are *ipso facto* inferior or irrelevant. Moreover, the bulk of material on the Internet is garbage, much of it trivial, irrelevant, and of unreliable provenance. It is easy to waste vast amounts of time surfing through it. The Internet is not a library; you cannot count on material found there to remain there, and to be retrievable, forever. If you rely on anything from the Internet as evidence to cite, you should print and keep a hard copy of it.

There are numerous guides to research methods and epistemological issues. You are not required to look at any of them, although doing so will not hurt your chances of constructing an impressive analysis. Examples include Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry* (Princeton University Press, 1994) and Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science* (Cornell University Press, 1997). A shorter and more lively and readable classic, one likely to be appreciated by non-professional scholars such as yourselves, is E. H. Carr, *What Is History?* (Vintage, 1961).

Guidelines for the Research Paper Proposal Due October 20

Begin thinking about your research paper topic *immediately*. If later sessions of the course are on subjects within which you think a topic of interest might lie, skip ahead to those sections of the syllabus and scan the assigned readings to help spur your thinking. If you have a general idea of the subject area that interests you, but are unsure about a specific topic or how to formulate a researchable question, consult the instructor for advice (do not wait until shortly before the proposal is due if you want considered recommendations).

Your paper topic may be on anything concerning U.S. national security policy that is connected to topics on this syllabus. If you are interested in a question about current or future policy you need to determine how evidence from the past will answer the question and select the right case studies or data to explore.

No later than September 26 go to the library and investigate the range of books and other sources that bear on the potential topics you have in mind. (Do not, however, spend time in the first stage carefully reading such books or documents. Scan them quickly to see what may be helpful, look more carefully at anything that seems exactly on point, but wait until you have a firmer sense of your topic before investing substantial time in lengthy specific sources.) As you go along in focusing your topic, compile a bibliography of sources that you intend to use.

The proposal **may not be more than 350 words** in length (excluding bibliography). ***Do not deviate from the stipulated format and length limit.*** The purpose of the proposal is not to present a preliminary version of the paper, but to indicate that you know what you are doing as you begin the process of developing it. Write only what is necessary to demonstrate that with prose that is clear, simple, and direct. The proposal must be presented under four headings:

1. **Question and Issue:** What are you investigating and why should anyone care? This section should be less than 50 words.
2. **Hypotheses and Tentative Argument:** What are potential answers to the question? Which seems likely to be correct? (As you develop the paper you are free to reach conclusions different from those anticipated at this stage. That is the purpose of research.) Be sure that your argument is a direct answer to the question posed in (1). This section should be less than 100 words.
3. **Research Plan:** How do you intend to analyze the question? What evidence – historical cases or data compilations – will you use to test hypotheses and illustrate your argument? *This is the most important part of the proposal, and the one that usually proves most deficient.* It should constitute about two-thirds of the prose proposal (i.e., excluding bibliography).
4. **Bibliography:** What sources have you consulted or do you intend to consult to guide your research and provide data? These should include some combination of books, articles, think tank papers, and official documents/publications (e.g., congressional hearings or departmental reports).

As in all work in life:

- Read carefully.
- Think hard:
 - Question assumptions and predispositions.
 - Distinguish evidence from intuition.
 - Consider alternative explanations
 - Anticipate counterarguments.
 - Ask what relevant information is missing.
 - Figure out what would disprove your conclusion.
- Write economically, clearly, and grammatically.
- Cite sources properly.