Course Description

The course is designed to review the principal features of international security as it is currently practiced. It does so by tracing the evolution of contemporary policy and other determining circumstances through the sequence of formative experience whereby current international security conditions developed. The underlying contention is that 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 state of international security at the moment.

The period of time reviewed begins with the circumstances and choices that shaped security policy after World War II. Contemporary security policy has deeper historical roots, but current conditions were heavily determined by the developments that occurred during the Cold War. Although it is common to assert that we are now in a new era, anyone who does not understand the formative events and enduring legacy of that period will certainly not understand the contemporary problems that are covered in the second half of the semester. The course reviews this history from contemporary perspective for the purpose of understanding the current implications. That is, of course, 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 (www.shc.umd.edu) at all times.

To prepare students to be effective participants in security policy debates, class participation counts for 20% 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 I can track them. They will be graded grade 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.

Students will sign up to write several short (1500 words) analytical memos in response to questions posed and readings assigned in the syllabus (ideas and evidence from outside readings can be incorporated but are not required). At least one memo should be submitted before spring break and one after it. Memos should be e-mailed to me by 11 am on the day of the session to which they pertain.

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. Students may rewrite one analytical memo and have the average score recorded. The rewrite must be submitted NLT two weeks after the initial grade and comments were received. No rewrites will be accepted after the last class session.

This semester, students in PUAF 720 will have the option of participating in a joint policy exercise with a group of students from the Moscow-based Institute for U.S.A. and Canada Studies (ISKLAN) in lieu of writing a third individual policy memo. The ISKLAN students will be at the University of Maryland from April 18–25. The two topics that MSPP and ISKLAN groups will be addressing are cybersecurity and ISIS/civil violence in Syria.

Active participation is essential to the success of the exercise, so anyone who chooses this option should make arrangements to be available for all of the joint sessions and to devote time to the drafting of the initial memo and the post-exercise memo. 720 students who do not take the joint policy exercise option are still encouraged to attend the social events we arrange for the ISKLAN group, including the movie night and the CISSM-ISKLAN dinner.

After spring break, the two teams of MSPP students will prepare “food for thought” memos laying out how they see their basic policy problem and what types of cooperative options they would like to explore with their Russian counterparts. The 720 “food for thought” memos should be exchanged with ISKLAN counterparts by April 12th.
The ISKRAN group will attend class on April 19th. We will start with an informal lunch and conversation from 12:30-1:30 pm, all-class discussion of the policy issues from 1:30-3:00 pm and initial team meetings from 3:00-4 pm. The most important interactions of the joint policy exercise will occur on Thursday, April 21 from 1:30 pm through 5:45 pm, so if you have a class that Thursday afternoon, please make sure that your professor will excuse you before committing to do the joint policy exercise rather than the third short memo. All 720 students are invited to dinner with the ISKRAN group at my house on Friday, April 22nd, and are also encouraged to socialize and sightsee with the Russian group outside of the scheduled activities.

After the visit, the MSPP teams will write a memo for me summarizing the policy objectives they had for the ISKRAN meetings, the points of agreement and disagreement that emerged from those meetings, and the recommendations that they would give U.S. policymakers for how to move forward with Russia on the topic. I will give each memo a base grade, and then award individual students bonus points based on their own evaluation of the exercise and their team-mates’ evaluations of their contributions.

The final synthetic policy memo (2500 words) will integrate concepts and evidence from multiple class sessions (assigned readings and discussions) and additional research if desired. It can build on ideas developed through one of the short analytical memos or the joint policy exercise. If students focus on a security policy problem that has not been a featured topic for this course, they need to show how 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 toward the desired outcome. It should assess the strengths and weaknesses of current policy, and recommend the five most important things that should be done to better address that problem. It will be due one week after the last class session.

Grading breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation (in-class, on-line forum, special events)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Memos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st memo</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd memo</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd memo or joint policy exercise memo</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final memo</td>
<td>due 4 pm May17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 recent 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 reserve using the Canvas system. 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 (January 26)**

   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 Post-War Security (February 2)**

   Readings:
   
   Bundy, pp. 130-196
   United Nations Charter, [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/docs/UNcharter.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/docs/UNcharter.pdf)
   NSC 68 (United States Objectives and Programs for National Security, April 14, 1950) [http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsc-hst/nsc-68.htm](http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsc-hst/nsc-68.htm) (20 pages)

   Memo Question: How did the US and USSR move in five short years from being victorious allies in World War II to heading opposing alliances in the Cold War? What lessons would you draw about ability of major powers with a mix of common and competing interests to cooperate on shared security problems?

3. **Nuclear Weapons, Coercive Diplomacy, and Deterrence (February 9)**

   Readings:
   
   Bundy, 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 (February 16)**

**Readings:**

Nancy W. Gallagher, “Four Logics for Cold War Nuclear Arms Control,” Chapter Two of *Strategic Logics for Arms Control* (45 pp. ms)

Bundy, 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, or was it either a waste of time or a dangerous delusion?

(5) **Limited War or Civil Conflict: Vietnam and Afghanistan in the Cold War (February 23)**

**Readings:**


**Memo Question:** Why weren’t the United States and the Soviet Union able to prevail over much weaker adversaries in Vietnam and Afghanistan? What, if any 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** (Mar 1)

**Readings:**

Bundy, pp. 584-617
Pavel Podvig, “Did Star Wars Help End the Cold War?” unpublished ms.

Memo question: What explains the peaceful ending of the Cold War? In retrospect, how well were the fundamental security problems resolved?

(7) **Emerging Problems of Civil Conflict (Mar 8)**

Readings:

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

Memo question: Is the control of civil conflict within sovereign states a general international interest?

*** Spring Break (March 15) ***
(8) **What Strategic Paradigm for International Security after the Cold War?** (March 22)

Readings:


Memo question: What should be the central principles of an effective and sustainable strategy for global security?

(9) **Nuclear Security in U.S.-Russia Relations – Bush/Obama** (Mar 29)

Readings:


Memo Question: In setting policy objectives for the U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons programs, what is the appropriate priority of interest among preserving deterrence, threatening pre-emption, assuring strict managerial control over reduced arsenals, and/or eliminating nuclear weapons? Recent events in Ukraine make U.S.-Russian nuclear cooperation more difficult, but do they also make it more or less important?

(10) Security Challenges in the Middle East Bush/Obama (April 5)

Readings:


Bahgat Korany, “The Middle East since the Cold War: Torn between Geopolitics and Geoeconomics,” in Louise Fawcett, ed., International Relations of the Middle East (Oxford, 2005), pp. 59-76


“Iraq Index” Brookings Institution website tracking variables of reconstruction and security in post-Saddam Iraq – skim, focusing on changes over time in the key indicators for violence, economic development, and governance. At: http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Centers/saban/iraq%20index/index201207.pdf


Dexter Filkins, “In Extremists’ Iraq, America’s Legacy,” The New Yorker (June 11, 2014), at:

Memo Question: Does the United States have a viable strategy for security in the Middle East that does not require open-ended military commitments?

(11) **Projected Proliferation (April 12)**

Readings:

Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT):


Jim Walsh, “Learning from Past Success: the NPT and the Future of Non-Proliferation,” (October 2005), WMDC paper no. 41 at:


*Solving the Iranian Nuclear Puzzle*, ACA Briefing Book, 3rd ed. (June 2014),

Robert Einhorn, “Preventing a Nuclear-Armed Iran: Requirements for a Comprehensive Nuclear Agreement,” Brookings Working Paper (March 31, 2014), at:

Memo Question: Is Iran’s nuclear program a special case that is best addressed through coercive counter-proliferation or is it better to resolve it using the cooperative nonproliferation principles?

12) **Joint Policy Exercise with ISKRAN Students**

For tips on effective teamwork, see: http://teamwork.umn.edu/

Schedule of joint activities (tentative):

**April 12**
Food for thought memos to ISKRAN (send to nilsug@gmail.com)

**April 19**
Lunch and get-acquainted conversation 12:30-1:20 pm
Joint discussion of the policy problems 1:30-3:00 pm
Preliminary team discussions 3:00-4:00 pm
Pizza dinner and Video: “A Walk in the Woods” 7:00-8:30 pm

April 21
CISSM Forum: U.S-Russian Cooperation on Syria’s Chemical Weapons 12:00-1:30 pm
Joint Policy Working Groups 1:30-4:00 pm
Joint Policy Presentations 4:15-5:45 pm

April 22
CISSM-ISKRAN dinner 6:30-8:30 pm

April 23-24
Sightseeing – tell Nilsu or Devin if you would like to spend one or both days with some of the ISKRAN students.

13) **Terrorism (April 26)**

Scott Atran, “The Moral Logic and Growth of Suicide Terrorism,” *The Washington Quarterly* (Summer 2006) [https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/washington_quarterly/v029/29.2atran.html](https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/washington_quarterly/v029/29.2atran.html)

**Memo Question:** Should terrorism be a primary international security priority?

(14) **Asian Security Arrangements (May 3)**

**Readings:**


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

15) **The Future of Global Security (May 10)**


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