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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 (CISSM forums, other such events on campus or downtown, Congressional hearings, movies, webinars, etc). For each event, they should post a reaction paragraph on the class discussion board connecting it to what we are reading and discussing in class. These posts will be reflected in the participation grade as a check or a plus.

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 two (1500 words) analytical memo in response to questions posed and readings assigned in the syllabus (ideas and evidence from outside readings can be incorporated but are not required). The first memo should be submitted before November 3rd. The second should be turned by the last day of class. Memos should be e-mailed to me by 1 am on the day of the class 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.?

Students may rewrite the 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 November 17th.

The second assignment will be a group presentation prepared for a fictional senior government official on a topic chosen randomly. The presentation should focus on analyzing the problem chosen, policy recommendations, assumptions, and alternative paths. A background memo should be provided one week prior to the presentation.

Each group presentation will be evaluated on five criteria:
1) Does the presentation provide a thoughtful treatment of the problem?
2) Does the presentation have a coherent logic to the policy recommendation?
3) Does the presentation convey and highlight the assumptions made in the recommendation?
4) Does the presentation highlight alternative courses of action and discuss the limitations of those courses of action?
5) Do the presenters handle unexpected changes during the presentation?

This semester, the class will participate in a policy simulation in lieu of a final exam. The simulation will utilize the platform developed by the ICONS project at the University of Maryland. The simulation will be based on a plausible scenario that will involve multiple actors. The class will divide up into teams that will represent different parties during a crisis.
There is no right answer to the scenario, but will expose the class to the realities of international security problems, the subtleties of negotiation, and the importance of interpersonal dynamics in resolving issues.

The simulation will be scheduled for the final exam period and last the entire allotment of time allocated. The exercise will require preparation prior to the simulation, and will be conducted utilizing the ICONS web platform (http://www.icons.umd.edu). Teams will be assigned a few weeks prior to the exam and will require each team to read the background materials, understand the goals of their country’s position, and push for a resolution that best suits the goals of your group. Your grade will depend upon your level of preparation and engagement during the exercise.

Grading breakdown:
- Participation (in-class, on-line forum, special events) 20%
- Analytical Memos
  - 1st memo 15%
  - 2nd memo 15%
- Group Presentation 25%
- Simulation Exercise 25%

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 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 (September 1st)**

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 (September 8th)

**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 (September 15th)

**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 and Nonproliferation (September 22nd)

**Readings:**

- 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** (September 29th)

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** (October 6th)

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** (October 13th)

**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?

(8) **Asian Security Arrangements** (October 20th)

**Readings:**


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

(9) **Security Challenges in the Middle East** (October 27th)

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


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

(10) **Projected Proliferation** (November 3rd)

Readings:


Memo Question: Does the JPOAC effectively resolve the Iranian proliferation problem or does it simply delay it?

(11) **Group Presentations** (November 10th)

(12) **Terrorism** (November 17th)

Readings:


[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?

(13) **Cyber Security** *(November 24th)*

**Readings:**


Memo Question: Is the threat of cyber disruption or espionage a international security problem or private issue best left to private industry?

(14) **What Strategic Paradigm for International Security?** (December 1st)

Readings:


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

(15) **The Future of Global Security** (December 8th)

Readings:


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