PSC 6349 International Security Politics
Summer Session II 2014

Dr. Austin M. Carson
acarson1@gwu.edu or austinmcarson@gmail.com

Tues/Thurs 6:10 pm - 8:20 pm
1957 E Street Room 315

Office: Institute for Security & Conflict Studies @ ESIA (Suite 605)
Office hours: 5 - 6:00 pm on Tues/Thurs or by appointment

This course provides students with an overview of the theoretical and policy debates that comprise the field of international security. Each week focuses on a discrete topic which collectively give students a sense of past, present, and future security challenges. We will analyze classic studies of why countries go to war as well as more recent research topics like why groups use terrorism, the emergence of humanitarian intervention, and the role of technology – from nuclear weapons to social media to unmanned drones – in both supplying and threatening international security.

One important goal of the course is for students to continually reflect on the core questions that animate the field of international security. These include:
- What is "security"? Who and what gets "secured"?
- Who should provide for security?
- What is the nature of warfare? Has it changed? Where is it headed?
- What is a "threat"? Which threats are significant enough to warrant a response?
- What are the new, emerging threats in the 21st century?

The course draws on readings from the academy as well as policy analysts, practitioners, journalists, and a few primary government policy documents. Students should be prepared to consume and reflect on both abstract theory and applied knowledge.

Course goals
This is a survey course on international security. The primary goal is to provide students with a foundation of knowledge on a range of topics in international security. This foundation should familiarize students new to international security with the major debates in the field and prepare them for more focused studies of topics in international security should they be of interest. Achieving this requires each student carefully read all assigned course material, participate in all seminar discussions, and complete course writing assignments. Secondary goals of the course include:
- Building oral presentation skills through leading and participating in seminar discussions.
- Sharpening concise writing skills. With many students bound for jobs in the Washington policy world, I include a memo writing assignment to practice concise written exposition.
- Improving research and analysis skills. An original research paper is assigned to give students a chance to improve their research and analysis skills. It will challenge students to design an interesting research question on a topic in international security, research it, and compose an essay with a coherent and compelling perspective.

Grading

Class participation (25%). Each student is required to attend all seminar sessions and actively contribute
    to discussion. Participation is not just about how much you speak, but about the quality of the
    contributions, how it helps the discussion, etc. Thus, asking a good question is of equal value to
    airing an opinion or bringing new information to our collective attention. This comprises a
    quarter of your final grade (25%). I will provide further guidance on how I assess participation in
    the first session.

Discussion leadership (10%). Each student must also act as a "discussion leader" for one session. This
    requires oral summary of readings and offering a set of thoughtful and diverse questions to drive
    discussion (10%). The leadership role is informal; no PowerPoint or extra research is required
    though students are welcome to be creative in how they lead. I will provide further guidance on
    discussion leadership and assign students to particular weeks in the first session.

Policy memo (25%). Each student will write a word-limited policy memo for a week of their choosing
    (must be a different week than the discussion leadership week). Detailed guidelines will be
    provided in the first session. The appendix below includes tips and suggestions on writing.

Research paper (10+30=40%). Each student will write a 15 page original research paper on an
    international security topic of their choosing. Given the short summer session, students should
    immediately begin planning this paper. An outline is due at the beginning of our 6th session
    (July 24) and will be graded pass/fail (10%). The final draft is due at the beginning of the final
    class on August 14 (30%). Early drafts of the paper may be sent for comments any time before
    August 12. Detailed guidelines on formatting, sources, etc., will be provided in the first week.
    An appendix at the end of the syllabus includes tips and suggestions on writing.

Course overview
1. July 8 (Tues). What is security?
2. July 10 (Thurs). Classics
3. July 15 (Tues). Nuclear weapons
4. July 17 (Thurs). International terrorism
5. July 22 (Tues). Civil war
6. July 24 (Thurs). Humanitarian intervention and the "responsibility to protect"
7. July 29 (Tues). Counterinsurgency
8. July 31 (Thurs). Democratic peace theory
9. August 5 (Tues). Multilateralism: international institutions and security
10. August 7 (Thurs). Balancing among great powers
11. August 12 (Tues). New developments, part 1: overview
12. August 14 (Thurs). New developments, part 2: leaks
Final paper due by 5 pm EST

Readings/textbooks
There is no textbook. All readings are available online through Google, through the GW library's
website, or on our Blackboard course page. You should not need to physically enter the Gelman Library
to obtain readings. Basically, I've done all the hard work. *It is therefore your positive responsibility to
ensure you can access readings in time to complete them before class.*

All journal articles are available online in databases accessible through the George Washington
University Library. From the library website (http://www.library.gwu.edu/) you have two options. Be sure

to try both options if any troubles arise. If you are accessing the library website from off campus, you will need to enter your last name and your GWID to obtain access. For some sessions, readings are from book chapters or books. These will be scanned and uploaded to the course Blackboard website under "Electronic Reserves."

1. Click the "Journals" tab, search for the desired journal title, and navigate to the correct volume and issue for the specific article in question.
2. Click the "ArticlePlus" tab and simply type the article title and author last name. It often helps to put the exact article title in quotation marks.

Course resources & policies
Attendance. Attendance at all seminars is mandatory for all students. The only exception is for a religious holiday (with prior notice), a documented medical emergency, or documented death of a close family member. I can often work around this rather strict policy if students approach me early and agree to a simple make-up assignment (typically a three page summary of the readings from the missed class).

Late papers. Any written assignment turned in late will be penalized one-third of a grade (i.e. from B to B-) per 24 hour period after the deadline. Since computers have a knack for crashing right before deadlines, it is wise to save drafts and back them up in the cloud.   Problems with technology are not an acceptable reason for late work.   Incompletes will not be allowed.

Disability. Any student who may need an accommodation based on the potential impact of a disability should contact the Disability Support Services office at (202) 994-8250 in the Marvin Center, Suite 242, to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. For additional information please refer to: http://gwired.gwu.edu/dss/.

Plagiarism and academic integrity. According to the university's Code of Academic Integrity, "Academic dishonesty is defined as cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information." For the rest of the code, see http://www.gwu.edu/~ntegrity/code.html. In general, I expect that you will not lie, cheat, steal, or otherwise conduct yourselves dishonorably, and will do something if you observe others engaging in such conduct. All work you submit for this course must be your own. I will not tolerate any form of academic dishonesty. Suspected cases will be referred to the Office of Academic Integrity. If you have questions about what constitutes proper use of published or unpublished sources, please ask the instructor.

Getting help & counseling. The University Counseling Center offers 24/7 assistance for students' personal, social, career, and study skills problems. Services for students include crisis and emergency mental health consultations, confidential assessment, counseling services (individual and small group), and referrals (see http://gwired.gwu.edu/counsel/CounselingServices/AcademicSupportServices).

Emergency preparedness information
Preventive measures
- Sign up for GW alerts through text and on your desktop computer: go to https://www.gwu.edu/~gwalert/pages/03_emergency_communications/ or call the GW Information Line at 202-994-5050.
- Alert DC is a citywide text/SMS notification: https://textalert.ema.dc.gov/index.php?CCheck=1
During an emergency

- Call GW Police Department at (202) 994-6111. If the line is unavailable dial 911.
- Option #1 Shelter in Place. Your first reaction in an emergency should be to stay where you are. Evacuate only if you hear the fire alarm or someone instructs you to evacuate. Shelter-in-place in an interior room, above ground level, and with the fewest windows.
- Option #2 Evacuation. We will always evacuate if the fire alarm sounds or the building becomes unsafe. Do not use the elevator.

Class schedule

Session 1: Tuesday, July 8

What is security? An overview

We begin by considering the meaning of "security." The assigned readings present a range of perspectives on what security refers to, who is secured, and how it can be measured. As you read, keep some of these questions in mind. Who must be secured to achieve "security"? Are there any issues which are inherently or inevitably included as "security"? What non-traditional issue areas, such as the environment, are worth including as "security" issues? What happens when a policy issue is framed as a "security" matter? We also read an overview of the three main theoretical traditions in the study of International Relations.

Required readings:

Mathews, Jessica Tuchman. "Redefining Security." Foreign Affairs, March 1, 1989.

Baldwin, David A. "The Concept of Security." Review of International Studies 23, no. 01 (1997): 5–26.

Howard, Michael. 2002. "What's In A Name?: How to Fight Terrorism." Foreign Affairs, January 1

Bergen, Peter. "Gun Violence Is a National Security Issue." CNN. Accessed December 19, 2012. http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/18/opinion/bergen-guns-national-security/index.html

Walt, S. M. 1998. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories." Foreign Policy: 29–46.

Skim and find one difference in what is included in "security" in these two key documents
        The National Security Strategy of the United States, September 2002
        http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf
        The National Security Strategy of the United States, May 2010.
        http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf

Other useful sources:

Miller, Benjamin. "The Concept of Security: Should It Be Redefined?" Journal of Strategic Studies 24, no. 2 (2001): 13–42.

Rothschild, Emma. 1995. "What Is Security?" Daedalus 124 (3) (July 1): 53–98.

Wolfers, Arnold. "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol." Political Science Quarterly 67, no. 4 (December 1, 1952): 481–502.

 "Securitization," Oxford Bibliographies.

http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199743292/obo-9780199743292-0091.xml

Session 2: Thursday, July 10
   Classics
   This session features some classic readings on international security that any student who takes a class like this should read and be familiar with. The traditional approach focuses on interstate war, security in terms of the state, and explains war largely based on rational policy decisions that respond to an unproblematic notion of threats to "national interest." Keep these questions in mind as you read. What does Clausewitz think war is? What is the trinity that he believes composes war? How do states wage war and why? Why do states go to war according to Blainey, Waltz, and Fearon? What are the similarities and differences among them? What role, if any, does emotion, irrationality, and mistakes play in the reason states go to war, according to these readings?

   Required readings:
   Skim both of these:
   >   Paret, Peter. "Clausewitz," in Peter Paret (ed.), The Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 186-213.
   >   von Clausewitz, Carl. On War. Edited and Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976). [pp. 75-89]

   Blainey, Geoffrey. The Causes of War. 3rd ed. Free Press, 1988. [Chpt 3]

   Waltz, Kenneth N. "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory." Journal of Interdisciplinary History (1988): 615–628.

   Fearon, James D. "Rationalist Explanations for War." International Organization 49, no. 3 (Summer 1995): 379–414. [Only read sections spanning 379-384, 390-393, 397-400, 404-408 ignoring the math]

   Other useful sources:
   Van Evera, Stephen. 1998. "Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War." International Security 22 (4): 5.

   Jervis, Robert. 1978. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." World Politics 30 (2) (January 1): 167–214.

Session 3: Tuesday, July 15
   Nuclear weapons
   Security, however it is defined, is inevitably tied up with technology. No technological development demonstrates its importance for security more than nuclear weaponry. We analyze the significance of the nuclear revolution, why states pursue nuclear weapons and use them, and the current diplomatic standoff over Iran's nuclear program. How did nuclear weapons change international politics? What should US policymakers do to deal with them and their spread?

   Required readings:

Jervis, Robert. The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution: Statecraft and the Prospect of Armageddon. Cornell University Press, 1989. [pp. 1-23]

Kaplan, Fred M. The Wizards of Armageddon. Stanford University Press, 1983. [pp. 74-84]
http://faculty.virginia.edu/nuclear/vault/readings/kaplan_wizards.pdf

Sagan, Scott D. 1996. "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb." International Security 21 (3) (December 1): 54–86.

Waltz, Kenneth N. 2012. "Why Iran Should Get the Bomb." Foreign Affairs, July 1.

Kahl, Colin H., and Kenneth N. Waltz. 2012. "Iran and the Bomb." Foreign Affairs, September 1.

Kroenig, Matthew. 2012. "Time to Attack Iran." Foreign Affairs, January 1.

Other useful sources:
Paul, T. V. 2012. "Disarmament Revisited: Is Nuclear Abolition Possible?" Journal of Strategic Studies 35 (1): 149–169.

Gavin, Francis J. "Politics, History and the Ivory Tower-Policy Gap in the Nuclear Proliferation Debate." Journal of Strategic Studies 35, no. 4 (2012): 573–600.

Tannenwald, Nina. 1999. "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use." International Organization 53 (03): 433–468.

Sagan, Scott D. "The Causes of Nuclear Weapons Proliferation." Annual Review of Political Science 14, no. 1 (2011): 225–244.

Waltz, Kenneth. The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Be Better, Adelphi Papers, Number 171 (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981).

Session 4: Thursday, July 17
International terrorism
The attacks on September 11, 2011 led to a wave of policy and scholarly attention on understanding the tactics of international terrorism, goals of terrorists, and the effectiveness of measures to prevent terrorism. Why do terrorists target what they target? What is the real threat posed by terrorism? How is terrorism best addressed? What is the future of Al Qaeda after the killing of Osama Bin Laden?

Required readings:
Crenshaw, Martha. 2007. "Explaining Suicide Terrorism: A Review Essay." Security Studies 16 (1): 133–162.

Cronin, Audrey Kurth. 2006. "How al-Qaida Ends: The Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups." International Security 31 (1) (July 1): 7–48.

Mueller, John. "Is There Still a Terrorist Threat?: The Myth of the Omnipresent Enemy." Foreign Affairs, September 1, 2006.

Jones, Seth G. 2012. "Think Again: Al Qaeda." Foreign Policy, June.
http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/23/think_again_al_qaeda.

Other useful sources:
Pape, Robert A. 2003. "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." American Political Science
Review 97 (3): 343–361.

Kydd, Andrew H., and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." International
Security 31 (1) (July 1): 49–80.

Mendelsohn, Barak. 2011. "Al-Qaeda's Franchising Strategy." Survival 53 (3): 29–50.

Abrahms, Max. 2006. "Why Terrorism Does Not Work." International Security 31 (2) (October
1): 42–78.

Posen, Barry R. 2002. "The Struggle Against Terrorism: Grand Strategy, Strategy, and Tactics."
International Security 26 (3) (January 1): 39–55.

Price, Bryan C. 2012. "Targeting Top Terrorists: How Leadership Decapitation Contributes to
Counterterrorism." International Security 36 (4) (April 1): 9–46.

Session 5: Tuesday, July 22
Civil war
While not strictly "international," recent civil wars in Syria and elsewhere make clear that wars
within states have profound implications for international security and often feature international
dimensions themselves. Civil wars have been one of the most active areas of research in
international security studies in the last ten years. We will consider: Why do they erupt? What
role does economic greed, ethnicity, history, and religion play? Are civil wars more common
today or are we simply paying more attention to them? How do they end?

Required readings:
Collier, Paul. 2003. "The Market for Civil War." Foreign Policy (136) (May 1): 38–45.

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." The
American Political Science Review 97 (1) (February 1): 75–90.

Bar-Tal, Daniel. 2007. "Sociopsychological Foundations of Intractable Conflicts." American
Behavioral Scientist 50 (11) (July 1): 1430–1453.

Salehyan. 2011. Rebels Without Borders: Transnational Insurgencies in World Politics. Cornell
University Press. [TBD]

Other useful sources:
Cederman, Lars-Erik, Nils B. Weidmann, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2011. "Horizontal
Inequalities and Ethnonationalist Civil War: A Global Comparison." American Political Science
Review 105 (03): 478–495.

Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler, Paul Collier, and World Bank. 1999. Greed and Grievance in Civil
War. World Bank Publications.
http://elibrary.worldbank.org/content/workingpaper/10.1596/1813-9450-2355.

Walter, Barbara F. 2009. "Bargaining Failures and Civil War." Annual Review of Political Science 12: 243–261.

Kalyvas, Stathis N. 2006. The Logic of Violence in Civil War. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press.

A review of civil war literature by Chris Blattman at:
http://chrisblattman.com/documents/research/2010.CivilWar.JEL.pdf

Session 6: Thursday, July 24 (*Research paper outline due at beginning of class*)
Humanitarian intervention and the "responsibility to protect"
The Western intervention to overthrow Qaddafi in Libya in 2011 was considered by many an instance of the emerging humanitarian norm of a "responsibility to protect." Humanitarian intervention is critical to understand both as a (new) practice in international security and as an example of the role of normative beliefs in influencing how states act. What are humanitarian norms? What are examples of such norms in security domains from earlier periods, such as the World War II-era humanitarian norms? What is the significance of a new norm protecting vulnerable civilian populations from their own governments? What is the nature of this obligation and who can fulfill it?

Required readings:
Evans, Gareth, and Mohamed Sahnoun. 2002. "The Responsibility to Protect." Foreign Affairs, November 1.

Weiss, Thomas G. 2011. "RtoP Alive and Well After Libya." Ethics & International Affairs 25 (3): 287+.

Bellamy, Alex J. 2011. "Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: The Exception and the Norm." Ethics & International Affairs 25 (3): 263+. Academic OneFile.

Finnemore, Martha. "Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention," in The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, edited by Peter J. Katzenstein.
http://www.metu.edu.tr/~utuba/Finnemore.pdf

Pape, Robert A. 2012. "When Duty Calls: A Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention." International Security 37 (1) (July 1): 41–80.

Other useful sources:
Valentino, Benjamin A. 2011. "The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention." Foreign Affairs, November 1.

Ogata, Sadako, and Johan Cels. 2003. "Human Security - Protecting and Empowering the People." Global Governance 9: 273.

King, Gary, and Christopher J. L. Murray. 2001. "Rethinking Human Security." Political Science Quarterly 116 (4) (December 1): 585–610.

Paris, Roland. 2001. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" International Security 26 (2) (October 1): 87–102.

Session 7: Tuesday, July 29
    Counterinsurgency
    The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the counterinsurgencies campaigns they ended up
    demanding led to a cottage industry of policy and academic analysis on how to defeat
    insurgencies. Western attempts to counter insurgencies go back to colonial occupation of
    European empires. We assess the reasons for insurgent success and the optimal methods for
    defeating insurgencies. Why do insurgencies break out? What do counterinsurgency campaigns
    from Malaysia or Algeria suggest about methods to end insurgencies? What are the main
    disagreements among American counter-insurgency specialists today? What role should counter-
    insurgency play in American defense policy?

    Required readings:
    Record, Jeffrey. "Why the Strong Lose," Parameters Vol. 35, No. 4 (2005-06), pp. 16-31.

    Tomes, Robert R. "Relearning Counterinsurgency Warfare," Parameters, (Spring 2004), pp. 16-
    28.

    Luttwak, Edward. "Dead End: Counterinsurgency Warfare as Military Malpractice," Harpers
    Magazine, February 2007, pp. 33-42.

    United States Army Field Manual 3-24, Counterinsurgency (Washington DC: The Department of
    the Army, 2006). [read Chpt 1, skim Chpt 5]

    Kilcullen, David. 2009. The Accidental Guerrilla: Fighting Small Wars in the Midst of a Big One.
    1st ed. Oxford University Press. [sections TBD]

    Other useful sources:
    Nagl, John A. 2005. Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya
    and Vietnam. 1st ed. University Of Chicago Press.

    Spear, Joanna. "Counterinsurgency" in Paul D. Williams (ed.), Security Studies: An Introduction
    (Oxford: Routledge, 2008), pp.389-406.

    Kaplan, Robert D., "Imperial Grunts: with the Army Special Forces in the Philippines and
    Afghanistan -
    laboratories of counterinsurgency," The Atlantic Monthly (October 2005).

    Long, Austin. "Small is Beautiful: The Counterterrorism Option in Afghanistan," Orbis (Spring
    2010): 199-214.

    McFate, Montgomery, "Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of their Curious
    Relationship," Military Review (March-April 2005).

Session 8: Thursday, July 31
    Democratic peace theory
    A core proposition in international security since Kant has been that representative democracies
    tend to be less war-prone than other government types. We evaluate the "democratic peace"
    thesis this week. Why are democracies thought to be less likely to wage war? What exceptions

might exist which make democracies more likely to wage certain kinds of wars? How might young democracies differ from mature democracies in relation to the democratic peace hypothesis? How do we evaluate the future of the Middle East, given the Arab Spring revolutions, in light of democratic peace research?

Required readings:
Ray, James Lee. 1997. "The Democratic Path to Peace." Journal of Democracy 8 (2): 49–64.

Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." American Political Science Review 97 (04): 585–602.

Mansfield, Edward, and Jack Snyder. 1995. "Democratization and War." Foreign Affairs, May 1.

Owen IV, John M. "Iraq and the Democratic Peace." Foreign Affairs, November 1, 2005.

Zoubir, Yahia H. 2012. "Qaddafi's Spawn." Foreign Affairs, July 24.

Ajami, Fouad. 2012. "The Arab Spring at One." Foreign Affairs, March 1.

Other useful sources:
Zakaria, Fareed. 1997. "The Rise of Illiberal Democracy." Foreign Affairs 76: 22.

Desch, Michael C. 2002. "Democracy and Victory: Why Regime Type Hardly Matters." International Security 27 (2) (October 1): 5–47.

Diamond, Larry Jay. 2005. "Lessons from Iraq." Journal of Democracy 16 (1): 9–23.

Reiter, Dan, and Allan Stam. 1998. "Democracy, War Initiation, and Victory." The American Political Science Review 92 (2) (June 1): 377–389.

Session 9: Tuesday, August 5
Multilateralism: international institutions and security
International organizations like the United Nations and NATO have played a critical role in uses of force and peacekeeping activities. Why do states use these security institutions? What benefits does multilateralism provide? What tradeoffs? The readings this week draw on the scholarly study of international organizations to understand how international security has been changed by the creation and use of international organizations.

Required readings:
Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. "Two Cheers for Multilateralism." Foreign Policy no. 60 (October 1, 1985): 148–167.

Thompson, Alexander. "Coercion Through IOs: The Security Council and the Logic of Information Transmission." International Organization 60, no. 01 (2006): 1–34.

Lindley, Dan. "Avoiding Tragedy in Power Politics: The Concert of Europe, Transparency, and Crisis Management," Security Studies, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Winter 2003/4), pp. 195-229. [Sections to focus on TBD]

Daalder, Ivo H., and James G. Stavridis. "NATO's Victory in Libya: The Right Way to Run an Intervention." Foreign Affairs 91 (2012): 2.

Other useful sources:
Claude, Inis L. 1966. "Collective Legitimization as a Political Function of the United Nations." International Organization 20 (3): 367–379.

Keohane, Robert O. 1984. After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. 1st Princeton Classic Ed. Princeton University Press.

Barnett, Michael, and Martha Finnemore. 2004. Rules For The World: International Organizations In Global Politics. Cornell University Press.

H-Diplo roundtable on Sarah E. Kreps. Coalitions of Convenience: United States Military Interventions After the Cold War. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. http://www.h-net.org/~diplo/ISSF/PDF/ISSF-Roundtable-4-7.pdf

Session 10: Thursday, August 7
Balancing among great powers
We focus on a classic topic of international security studies: the balance of power among the great states of the system. We revisit Waltz (from Session 1) and other scholars who believe just knowing how many great powers are in the system sheds light on the likelihood of major war. We also review policy debates about the balance of power today and the American and Chinese roles in it. What factors constitute the "balance of power"? Why do states pursue great power status? What is the difference between balance of power and balance of threat? What is the current balance of power? What does the rise of China mean for the balance of power and what will happen in East Asia as a result?

Required readings:
Mearsheimer, John. "Anarchy and the Struggle for Power," in The Tragedy of Great Power Politics (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001). [pp. 29-54]

Walt, Stephen M. 1985. "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power." International Security 9 (4): 3–43. [Sections TBD]

Brooks, Stephen G., and William C. Wohlforth. 2002. "American Primacy in Perspective." Foreign Affairs, July 1.

Glaser, Charles. 2011. "Will China's Rise Lead to War?" Foreign Affairs, March 1.

Christensen, Thomas J. 2001. "Posing Problems Without Catching Up: China's Rise and Challenges for U.S. Security Policy." International Security 25 (4) (April 1): 5–40.

Other useful sources:
Haas, Ernst B. 1953. "The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept, or Propaganda." World Politics 5 (4) (July): 442–477.

Levy, Jack S., and William R. Thompson. 2005. "Hegemonic Threats and Great Power Balancing in Europe, 1495-1999." Security Studies 14 (1): 1–33.

Beckley, Michael. 2011. "China's Century?: Why America's Edge Will Endure." International Security 36 (3): 41–78.

Christensen, Thomas J. 2009. "Shaping the Choices of a Rising China: Recent Lessons for the Obama Administration." The Washington Quarterly 32 (3): 89–104.

Session 11: Tuesday, August 12
New developments (Part 1): overview
We conclude by looking towards the future. What macro-trends in technology, ideas, and governance will produce major changes in international security? In this first part we look at a few answers that emerged from the immediate post-Cold War period when speculation about the future of world politics was especially common. Then we look at a set of issues that have more recently come to the fore. What does military robotics portend for how war is conducted? How do global warming and the emergence of new spaces for political competition mean for international security? How might social media influence the domestic relationship between the people and the state?

Required readings:
Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" Foreign Affairs, June 1.

Mueller, John. 1990. "The Obsolescence of Major War." Security Dialogue 21 (3): 321–328.

Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History," The National Interest, Summer 1989.

Singer, Peter W. 2009. Wired for War: The Robotics Revolution and Conflict in the 21st Century. Penguin Press. [TBD]

Clay Shirky, "The Political Power of Social Media: Technology, the Public Sphere and the State," Foreign Affairs, January/February (2011).

Borgerson, Scott G. 2008. "Arctic Meltdown." Foreign Affairs, March 1.

Other useful sources:
Mearsheimer, John J. "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War," The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 266, No. 2, August 1990, pp. 35-50.

Kaplan, Robert. "The Coming Anarchy," The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 273, No. 2, February 1994. pp. 44-76.

Schweller, Randy. "Ennui Becomes Us," The National Interest, January-February 2010. http://nationalinterest.org/article/ennui-becomes-us-3330

Brown, Michael E. "New Global Dangers", in Leashing the Dogs of War, Chester Crocker, Fenn O. Hampson and Pamela Aall (eds.), (Washington, DC: USIP Press, 2007), pp. 39-51.

Toft, Monica Duffy. 2007. "Getting Religion? The Puzzling Case of Islam and Civil War." International Security 31 (4) (April 1): 97–131.

Freedman, Lawrence. 2001. "The Third World War?" Survival 43 (4): 61–88.

Session 12: Thursday, August 14 (*Research paper due at beginning of class*)
      New developments (Part 2): leaks
      In the second part on future trends, we focus on an area of my particular interest: information security and leaks. Unauthorized disclosure of national security documentation by WikiLeaks and Edward Snowden are seen by many as heralding a future in which states can no longer securely manage classified information. We assess whether these leak episodes really are harbingers of a new vulnerability in state of information security. We also analyze the significance, if true, of a future in which WikiLeaks-style disclosure is a regular threat.

      Required readings:
      Star, Alexander. Open Secrets: WikiLeaks, War and American Diplomacy. The New York Times Company, 2011. [Overview and selected leaked cables TBD]

      Farrell, Henry, and Martha Finnemore. "The End of Hypocrisy." Foreign Affairs, October 15, 2013.

      Pozen, David E. "The Leaky Leviathan: Why the Government Condemns and Condones Unlawful Disclosures of Information." Harvard Law Review 127, no. 2 (December 2013): 512–635. [Sections TBD]

      Morozov, Evgeny. "WikiLeaks and the Perils of Extreme Glasnost." New Perspectives Quarterly 28, no. 1 (January 1, 2011): 7–11.

      Page, Mark, and J. E. Spence. "Open Secrets Questionably Arrived At: The Impact of Wikileaks on Diplomacy." Defence Studies 11, no. 2 (2011): 234–43. [Skim only]

      Shafer, Jack. "Live and Let Leak." Foreign Affairs, February 12, 2014.

      Carson, Austin. "Back Stages and Big Disclosures: What Erving Goffman Tells Us about Secrecy, Leaks, and International Order." Unpublished manuscript (2014). [Sections TBD]

      Other useful sources:
      Franck, Thomas M., and Edward Weisband, eds. Secrecy and Foreign Policy. Oxford University Press, 1974.

      Mitchell, Greg. The Age of WikiLeaks: From Collateral Murder to Cablegate. Sinclair Books, 2011.

      Greenwald, Glenn. No Place to Hide: Edward Snowden, the NSA, and the U.S. Surveillance State. First Edition edition. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, 2014.

      Schoenfeld, Gabriel. Necessary Secrets: National Security, the Media, and the Rule of Law. 1st ed. W. W. Norton & Company, 2010.

      Sagar, Rahul. Secrets and Leaks: The Dilemma of State Secrecy. Princeton University Press, 2013.

      American Bar Association Standing Committee on Law and National Security, Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive, and National Strategy Forum. No More Secrets: National Security Strategies for a Transparent World. Post Workshop Report, March 2011.

Appendix: Suggestions and Tips on Writing

(Adapted from material by Dr. Jo Spear)

Sources
Please use a mix of sources for your paper; books, articles, original documents (where available) and online sources. You should always approach sources as a critical reader. Make your own judgment about the credibility of what they say and critically evaluate the sources they use and whether the empirical evidence justifies the conclusions that they reach. Also, please *do not* use Wikipedia as a source; it lacks key academic features such as clear authorship, stable text etc. Internet sources can be suspect (anyone can put materials up on the web) so please approach these cautiously.

Focus Your Paper
A common structural problem with student papers is that they lack sufficient focus. There are some easy ways to avoid this problem. The first and best is to give yourself a ***very specific question*** (this is surprisingly hard to do well) and then structure your paper to address it. The worst case is a paper where you do not have a question. Thus it may have a general title like "The Kosovo Crisis" and it may contain a lot of facts. However, there will be no explanation of why the facts matter and no explanation for why events transpired as they did rather than some other way. In short, the paper will be an unstructured discursive wander around the issues. You may show some research skills in answering in this fashion, but you will not necessarily show any structuring or analytical skills; these are essential in both academic and policy writing.

Better approach. Where you have a question, but it allows you to just give a narrative answer. For example, "What role did the U.S. play in the Kosovo crisis?" This at least suggests a structure for the paper and could be used to establish some categories (for example, political role, military role, peacemaking role, reconstruction role). In an answer to this you would certainly display some research skills, but not the analytical skills that bring you closer to a grade of 'A'.

Best approach: The question is focused and forces you to make judgments about causality and event importance. For example, "Why did the U.S. become involved in the Kosovo crisis?" This type of a question is that there are a number of contending answers, so you really have to think about what you include, how you approach it, what you argue and how persuasive that argument is. This type of question also encourages a more sophisticated structure than merely a narrative. Thus, in answering this, your paper could be structured to summarize the event, explain its significance, and make your own interpretation of what the key factors were that produced U.S. involvement in Kosovo. You would use course material, your own research, and your own judgment to justify your conclusions about what really mattered.

Showcase Your Skills
The best papers showcase skills like:
- Your understanding of the course materials (not just your original research)
- Your ability to conduct broad and deep original research
- Your ability to comprehend and use different kinds of documents (scholarly; policy-focused; primary government)
- Your ability to situate your knowledge in wider context (historical; academic discipline)
- Your ability to draw insights from interesting, creative places (from other disciplines or expertise areas; from other historical eras; from other domains in international security)
- Your ability to make judgments about what causes what

- Your ability to present work in a suitable academic format, for example, to write a paper with a strong introduction and conclusion, to effectively footnote to providing an accurate 'paper trail' and an alphabetized bibliography.
- Your ability to edit your work effectively.

Twenty Basic Rules
These are derived from Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), pp. 123-128 and Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb and Joseph M. Williams, *The Craft of Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Selecting a Topic, Making an Argument and Organizing Your Work
1. Pick an important topic
2. Pick a manageable topic
3. Say something new and important
4. Concentrate on making a single set of arguments
5. Do not over-state or under-state your claims
6. Acknowledge other viewpoints and treat them with respect
7. Anticipate and pre-empt counter-arguments
8. Outline everything before writing anything
9. Start with a proper introduction and end with a proper conclusion
10. Use headings and sub-headings to provide structure and to convey your main points

Writing
1. Identify in your head – and write to – your audience
2. Get to the point
3. Stick to the point
4. Stay out of the weeds
5. Be precise
6. Be concise
7. Avoid jargon
8. Always write second and third drafts
9. Never plagiarize
10. Proofread every single words