Course Description
This course reviews the principal features of international security as currently practiced. It traces the evolution of contemporary policy and other determining circumstances through the sequence of formative experience whereby current international security conditions developed. Understanding the consequence of formative experience is indispensable for adequate comprehension of the prevailing concepts, organizing principles, military deployment patterns, legal regulations, and political relationships that determine the current state of international security.

The course begins with the circumstances and choices that shaped security policy after World War II. Contemporary security policy has deeper historical roots, but developments during the Cold War shaped the concepts, institutions, force structures, arms control agreements, and political debates that are particularly important today. Although it is common to assert that we are in a new era, anyone who does not understand the formative events and enduring legacy of that period will not understand the contemporary problems covered in the second half of the semester. Reviewing history from contemporary perspective is a revisionist perspective from the point of view of those who lived through the events in question, but it is legitimate and important to use the advantage of retrospect to understand current circumstances.

The course is intended to be useful and appropriate for all people of whatever national affiliation. There is heavy emphasis on the experience of the United States and of Russia as principal successor to the Soviet Union because the historical interaction between these two countries has disproportionately affected the international security conditions that all other countries now experience. Understanding this experience is a necessary foundation for any more focused national security perspective a student might wish to develop.

Requirements
This course is designed to help students develop the broad knowledge and analytical capabilities needed to understand complex policy issues, as well as the oral, written, and interpersonal skills needed to participate effectively in policy debates. Students will maintain the highest standards of professional behavior and will adhere to the University of Maryland’s Code of Academic Integrity, Code of Conduct, and other education policies (www.shc.umd.edu) at all times.

Grading
Grading breakdown for the course is as follows:

- Participation (in-class) 15%
- Analytical Memos (3-pages, double-spaced)
  - 1st memo 20%
  - 2nd memo 20%
- Final Memo (6-pages, double-spaced) 30%
- Op-Ed or Opinion Paper 15%

Letter grades are decided at the end of the semester based on the cumulative grades in the course.
In-Class Participation
To prepare students to be effective participants in security policy debates, class participation counts for 15% of the grade and will be evaluated in several different ways. Students are expected to prepare thoroughly, attend consistently, and engage actively in class discussions. Please e-mail me in advance if you must miss class for any reason.

Students should attend at least three special events related to international security policy (e.g., CISSM forums, other such events on campus or downtown, Congressional hearings, movies, webinars, etc.). For each event, they should post a reaction paragraph or two on the class discussion board connecting it to what we are reading and discussing in class. Please also e-mail me your reaction paragraphs so I can track them. They will be graded as a check or a plus for participation.

Students are also encouraged to use the on-line forum to continue discussions begun in class; to share relevant news, articles, and event announcements; and to pose questions about readings that they want to discuss during the next class. Use of this forum will also factor into participation grade.

First and Second Analytical Memos
Students will write two short (3-pages, double-spaced) analytical memos in response to questions posed and readings assigned in the syllabus. The first memo should be submitted on or before October 10 and can be on any of the questions listed from week 2 (September 5) to week 7 (October 10). The second memo should be submitted by November 28 and can be on any of the questions listed from week 8 (October 17) to week 14 (November 28).

The memos are to be submitted on the day of the session in class to which they pertain at the beginning of the class session. No memos will be accepted after the relevant class session. Equally, emailed memos will not be accepted.

Each memo will be graded on five main criteria:

1. Does it have a clear, coherent, compelling, and creative central argument?
2. Is that central argument well supported?
3. Are counter-arguments and/or alternative points of view weighed?
4. Are important and interesting policy implications drawn from the analysis?
5. Is the memo professionally written – grammatically correct, appropriate tone, fact checked, numbered pages, etc.?

For guidance on writing clear, effective policy memos, see the sample 720 memo and George Orwell’s essay on “Politics and the English Language,” both of which are in the class resource folder.

Final Memo
In the final memo (6-pages, double spaced), students may focus on EITHER an international security policy problem that has been covered in class OR on an international security policy problem that has not been covered in class. In the case of the latter, students will have to show what they have read, heard, and learned in this class helps them think through that policy problem. The memo should explain to a national leader (US president or other country) or to the UN Secretary General why the issue you have chosen should be a top priority for international security, what the key elements of an effective response would be, and how the world could move from where we are towards the desired outcome. It should assess the strengths and
weaknesses of current policy and recommend the three most important things that should be done to better address that problem. This memo is due in class on December 5. Emailed submissions will not be accepted.

**Op-Ed or Opinion Paper**
The op-ed should be between 700-800 words on any international security policy problem students are interested in writing about – whether or not it has been covered in class – and should be submitted in a format ready to be sent to a media outlet. This assignment is due in class on October 10. Emailed submissions will not be accepted.


**Readings and Resources**
The central reading for the historical part of the course is McGeorge Bundy, *Danger and Survival*. Although the book is out of print, Francesca Perry (room 4130, fperry1@umd.edu, ext. 57611) has used copies that she will sell for $5 and repurchase at the end of the semester.

The campus bookstore has copies of two recommended books. Several chapters of John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* are assigned and the whole book is relevant. Since the course deals extensively with nuclear issues, the bookstore also has Richard Garwin and Georges Charpak, *Megawatts and Megatons*, which is useful for students who have a particular interest in nuclear weapons and energy technologies.

The course also relies heavily on articles and reports, many of which are available on the internet, and links have been provided whenever possible. The remainder of the assigned readings will be placed on ELMS. To access these readings, go to [https://elms.umd.edu](https://elms.umd.edu) and enter your user name and password (the same ones that you use to access your University of Maryland email account), and then click on PUAF 720. Depending on class interests and developments in current policy debates, I may supplement or substitute readings as the semester progresses.

**Schedule**

1. **Introduction (August 29)**
   
   **Reading:**
   
   McGeorge Bundy, *Danger and Survival*, pp. 3-130, especially pp. 3-11; pp. 45-63; and pp. 98-130
   
   **Question for reflection:** Was the development of nuclear weapons inevitable once the basic physical principles were understood? What does this imply for current efforts to control the spread of nuclear weapons and other advanced technologies with military applications?

2. **Determinants of International Order (September 5)**

   **Readings:**
   
   Bundy, pp. 130-196

United Nations Charter: [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/docs/UNcharter.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/docs/UNcharter.pdf)


**Memo Question:** How did the United States and the Soviet Union move in five short years from being victorious allies in World War II to heading opposing alliances in the Cold War?

(3) **Nuclear Weapons, Coercive Diplomacy, and Deterrence (September 12)**

**Readings:**

Bundy, *Danger and Survival*, pp. 197-462

**Memo question:** Were the size and operational configuration of the nuclear forces originally deployed by the United States and the Soviet Union strategically justified?

(4) **Arms Control (September 19)**

**Readings:**

Bundy, *Danger and Survival*, pp. 463-583
Gray, Colin S., “Arms control does not control arms,” *Orbis* 37:3 (Summer 1993), 16p

**Memo question:** Did arms control make a meaningful contribution to security during the Cold War?

(5) **Limited War vs. Civil Conflict: Vietnam and Afghanistan in the Cold War (September 26)**

**Readings:**


**Memo Question:** What lessons would you draw about the relative importance of military power and political legitimacy when foreign powers intervene in civil conflicts because they see them as part of a larger security problem?

**6) The Incomplete Ending of the Cold War (October 3)**

**Readings:**

Bundy, *Danger and Survival*, pp. 584-617

**Memo question:** What explains the peaceful ending of the Cold War?

**7) The Broadening of the Security Agenda (October 10)**

**Readings:**

Edward W. Luttwak, “Give War a Chance,” *Foreign Affairs*, (July/Aug 1999), pp. 36-44

**Memo question:** Is human security an international security concern?
(8) Nuclear Weapons in the 21st Century (October 17)

Readings:


Memo Question: Do nuclear weapons provide a secure deterrent?

(9) Proliferation (October 24)

Readings:


Memo Question: Why do states acquire nuclear weapons?

(10) **Cyber Security (October 31)**

Readings:

David Clark, Thomas Berson, and Herbert S. Lin (Eds.), “At the Nexus of Cybersecurity and Public Policy”, National Academies Press, 2014 (Chapters 1-4): [https://docs.house.gov/meetings/IF/IF02/20150303/103079/HHRG-114-IF02-20150303-SD006.pdf](https://docs.house.gov/meetings/IF/IF02/20150303/103079/HHRG-114-IF02-20150303-SD006.pdf)

Memo Question: How can states deter cyber incidents?

(11) **Security in Asia (November 7)**

Readings:


Memo Question: How should the United States respond to China’s growing economic, military, and political power?

(12) **Security in the Middle East (November 14)**

Readings:


Kenneth M. Pollack, “Fight or Flight: America’s Choice in the Middle East,” *Foreign Affairs* (March 1, 2016).


Memo Question: Did the Arab Spring pose a threat to international security?

** Thanksgiving Break (November 21) **

(13) **Terrorism (November 28)**

Readings:


Memo Question: Is the threat of terrorism a primary international security priority?

The Future of Global Security (December 5)

Readings:


Managing Global Insecurity Project, “A Plan for Action,” September 2008:

John Bolton, “Should We Take Global Governance Seriously?” *Chicago Journal of International Law* 205 (Fall 2000), pp. 205-221


Sara Z. Kutchesfahani, “Now – more than ever – is the time for creative diplomacy,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (February 8, 2018):
[https://thebulletin.org/2018/02/now-more-than-ever-is-the-time-for-creative-diplomacy/](https://thebulletin.org/2018/02/now-more-than-ever-is-the-time-for-creative-diplomacy/)