

## INTERNATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

PLCY 720  
Fall 2018  
Wednesdays: 9:15–11:45AM  
VMH 1107

Dr. Sara Z. Kutchesfahani  
Office Hours: by apt.  
[skutchesfahani@armscontrolcenter.org](mailto:skutchesfahani@armscontrolcenter.org)

### 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](http://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) | 1 <sup>st</sup> memo | 20% |
|   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> 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.

For useful tips on how to write an effective op-ed, please see Bret Stephens, “Tips for Aspiring Op-Ed Writers,” *The New York Times*, August 25, 2017: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/25/opinion/tips-for-aspiring-op-ed-writers.html>

### **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](mailto: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> 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 PUA 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

John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (Penguin Press, 2005), pp. 5-47

Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977): pp. ix-52

Vladislav Zubok and Constantine Pleshankov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War* (Harvard University Press, 1996), pp. 1-8 and 36-77

United Nations Charter: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/docs/UNcharter.pdf>

George Kennan, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs* 24:4 (1947):

<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/23331/x/the-sources-of-soviet-conduct>

NSC 68 (United States Objectives and Programs for National Security, April 14, 1950)

[https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study\\_collections/coldwar/documents/pdf/10-1.pdf](https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/documents/pdf/10-1.pdf)

Paul C. Avey and Michael C. Desch, "What do Policymakers Want from Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers," *International Studies Quarterly* 58.2 (2014), pp. 227-246

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

Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," *Signs* 12:4 (Summer 1987), pp. 687-718

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:

Nancy W. Gallagher, "Re-Thinking the Unthinkable: Arms Control in the Twenty-First Century," *The Nonproliferation Review* 22:3-4 (2015), pp. 469-498

Bundy, *Danger and Survival*, pp. 463-583

Thomas Schelling, "What Went Wrong with Arms Control?" *Foreign Affairs* 64:2 (Winter, 1985): 219-233

Albert Carnesale and Richard Haass, eds., *Superpower Arms Control: Setting the Record Straight* (Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1987), pp. 329-357

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:

James Patterson, *Grand Expectations* (Oxford UP, 1996), pp. 593-636 and 743-770

Alex Wallerstein, "Would Nukes have Helped in Vietnam?" Nuclear Secrecy Blog post July 25, 2014, at: <http://blog.nuclearsecrecy.com/2014/07/25/nukes-helped-vietnam/>

Mark Galeotti, *Afghanistan: The Soviet Union's Last War* (London: Frank Cass, 1995), pp. 1-25, 139-171

Robert McNamara, *In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam* (New York: Vintage Books, Random House, Inc., 1995), pp 319-335

Melvin Laird, "Iraq: Learning the Lessons of Vietnam," *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2005)

Stephen Biddle, "Seeing Baghdad, Thinking Saigon," *Foreign Affairs* (March/April 2006)

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

John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War*, pp. 195-237

Jeffrey W. Knopf, "Did Reagan Win the Cold War?" *Strategic Insights*, 3:8, August 2004;

<https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=444565>

Pavel Podvig, "Did Star Wars Help End the Cold War?" *Science and Global Security* 25:1 (Winter 2017), pp. 3-27

Catherine Kelleher, "Cooperative Security in Europe," pp. 293-353 in Janne Nolan, ed., *Global Engagement*, (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1994)

Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* 21:3 (Winter 1996/97), pp. 5-53

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

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

Readings:

John Steinbruner and Jason Forrester, "Perspectives on Civil Violence: A Review of Current Thinking," pp. 1-27 in William Lahneman, ed., *Military Intervention* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004)

Roland Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" *International Security* 26:2 (2001), pp.87-102

J. Joseph Hewitt, Jonathan Wilkenfeld, and Ted Robert Gurr, *Peace and Conflict 2008*, Executive Summary (CIDCM)

Gareth Evans, "Cooperative Security and Intra-State Conflict," *Foreign Policy*, (1996)

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

Mohammed Ayoob, "Humanitarian Intervention and State Sovereignty," *International Journal of Human Rights* 6:1 (Spring 2002)

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect* (December 2001), pp. xi – 20, at <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>

Karen A. Mingst and Margaret P. Karns, "The United Nations and Conflict Management," in Chester A. Crocker, et al., *Leashing the Dogs of War*, (USIP, 2007), pp. 497-520

Memo question: Is human security an international security concern?

**(8) Nuclear Weapons in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (October 17)**

Readings:

Sidney Drell and James Goodby, "What are Nuclear Weapons For?" An Arms Control Association Report (revised and updated October 2007):

[http://www.armscontrol.org/system/files/20071104\\_Drell\\_Goodby\\_07\\_new.pdf](http://www.armscontrol.org/system/files/20071104_Drell_Goodby_07_new.pdf)

Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press, "The Nukes We Need: Preserving the American Deterrent," *Foreign Affairs* 88:6 (November/December 2009), pp. 39-51

Barack Obama, "Remarks in Prague, Czech Republic," (April 5, 2009):

<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-barack-obama-prague-delivered>

"New START at a Glance," Arms Control Association Fact Sheet, October 2010 (Updated March 2018):

<http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/NewSTART>

Nikolai Sokov, "The Return of Nuclear Weapons," November 28, 2014:

<https://www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/nikolai-sokov/%E2%80%98return%E2%80%99-of-nuclear-weapons>

The Deep Cuts Commission, "Back from the Brink: Toward Restraint and Dialogue Between Russia and the West," (June 2016):

[http://deepcuts.org/images/PDF/Third\\_Report\\_of\\_the\\_Deep\\_Cuts\\_Commission\\_English.pdf](http://deepcuts.org/images/PDF/Third_Report_of_the_Deep_Cuts_Commission_English.pdf)

2018 Nuclear Posture Review Executive Summary (15 pp): <https://fas.org/wp-content/uploads/media/2018-Nuclear-Posture-Review-Version-2.pdf>

Olga Oliker and Andrey Baklitskiy, "The Nuclear Posture Review and Russian 'De-Escalation': A Dangerous Solution to a Nonexistent Problem," *War on the Rocks*, February 20, 2018:

<https://warontherocks.com/2018/02/nuclear-posture-review-russian-de-escalation-dangerous-solution-nonexistent-problem/>

Madelyn Creedon, "A Question of Dollars and Sense: Assessing the 2018 Nuclear Posture Review," *Arms Control Today* (March 2018): <https://www.armscontrol.org/print/9279>

Memo Question: Do nuclear weapons provide a secure deterrent?

**(9) Proliferation (October 24)**

Readings:

Francis Gavin, "Strategies of Inhibition: U.S. Grand Strategy, the Nuclear Revolution, and Nonproliferation," *International Security* 40:1 (Summer 2015), pp. 9-46

Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT): <https://1997-2001.state.gov/global/arms/treaties/npt1.html>

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

<https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/files/wmdcno41.pdf>

Christopher F. Chyba, Chaim Braun, and George Bunn, "New Challenges to the Nonproliferation Regime" and "Strategies for Tackling Proliferation Challenges," pp. 126-219 in Bunn and Chyba, eds. *U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy* (Stanford, 2006)

Rebecca Johnson, "Assessing the 2010 NPT Review Conference," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (July/August 2010)

Christopher A. Ford, "The 2015 NPT Review Conference and the Nonproliferation Regime," *New Paradigms Forum* (June 3, 2015): <http://www.newparadigmsforum.com/NPftestsite/?p=1922>

- Scott Sagan, "The Korean Missile Crisis: Why Deterrence is Still the Best Option," *Foreign Affairs* 96 (November/December 2017)
- Robert Jervis, "Unpacking a US Decision to Use Force against North Korea: Issues, Options, and Consequences," *38 North Special Report* (January 2018): [https://www.38north.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/38-North-SR-1801\\_Jervis.pdf](https://www.38north.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/38-North-SR-1801_Jervis.pdf)
- Bruce Klingner, "Maximum Pressure and Engagement – Still Pulling Punches on U.S. Policy toward North Korea, SFRC testimony, July 25, 2017: [https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/072517\\_Klingner\\_Testimony.pdf](https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/072517_Klingner_Testimony.pdf)
- Leon Sigal, "A Strategy for Dealing with North Korea," SFRC testimony, July 25, 2017: [https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/072517\\_Sigal\\_Testimony.pdf](https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/072517_Sigal_Testimony.pdf)
- Jon Wolfsthal, "A Crucial First Step for Negotiating with North Korea," (March 16, 2018): <https://warontherocks.com/2018/03/when-negotiating-with-north-korea-the-first-step-may-be-the-hardest/>

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>

Memo Question: How can states deter cyber incidents?

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

Readings:

- Muthiah Alagappa, "Asia's Security Environment: From Subordinate to Region Dominant System," Chapter 1 in *The Long Shadow* (Stanford UP, 2008)
- David Shaumbaugh, "China's Global Economic Presence," pp. 121-155 in *China Goes Global: The Partial Power* (Oxford University Press, 2013)
- James B. Steinberg, "Administration's Vision of the U.S.-China Relationship," Keynote Address at the Center for a New American Security, Washington, D.C., September 24, 2009: <https://2009-2017.state.gov/s/d/former/steinberg/remarks/2009/169332.htm>
- Thomas J. Christensen, "Obama and Asia: Confronting the China Challenge," *Foreign Affairs* (2015)
- Lora Saalman, "China and the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, (February 2011), pp. 1-39: [http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/china\\_posture\\_review.pdf](http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/china_posture_review.pdf)
- Gregory Kulacki, "China's Nuclear Force: Modernizing from Behind," Union of Concerned Scientists (February 1, 2018): <https://allthingsnuclear.org/gkulacki/china-and-trumps-nuclear-posture-review>
- "Dangerous Waters: China-Japan Relations on the Rocks," International Crisis Group, Asia Report No. 245 (April 8, 2013): <https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/north-east-asia/china/dangerous-waters-china-japan-relations-rocks>

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:

Peter Sluglett, "The Cold War in the Middle East," pp. 41-58 in Louise Fawcett, ed., *International Relations of the Middle East* (Oxford, 2005)

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

Toby Dodge, "Iraqi Transitions: from Regime Change to State Collapse," *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 4-5, 2005, pp 705-721

Daniel Byman, "Explaining the Western Response to the Arab Spring," *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 36:2 (2013)

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

Madoka Futamura, Edward Newman, and Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh, "Towards a Human Security Approach to Peacebuilding," United Nations University Research Brief (2010):

[http://www.academia.edu/3487244/ Towards a Human Security Approach to Peacebuilding United Nations University Research Brief No.2 2010 with Madoka Futamura and Edward Newman](http://www.academia.edu/3487244/Towards_a_Human_Security_Approach_to_Peacebuilding_United_Nations_University_Research_Brief_No.2_2010_with_Madoka_Futamura_and_Edward_Newman)

Anthony Cordesman, "The [New-Old] Crises and Instability in the Middle East and North Africa in 2016," Center for Strategic & International Studies (2016):

<https://www.csis.org/analysis/new-old-crises-and-instability-middle-east-and-north-africa-2016>

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

**\*\* Thanksgiving Break (November 21) \*\***

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

Readings:

Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism," *International Security* 27:3 (Winter 2002/3), pp. 30-58

Daniel Byman, "Do Counterproliferation and Counterterrorism Go Together?" *Political Science Quarterly* 122:1 (2007), pp. 25-46

Scott Atran, "The Moral Logic and Growth of Suicide Terrorism," *The Washington Quarterly* 29:2 (Spring 2006)

Matthew Kroenig and Barry Pavel, "How to Deter Terrorism," *The Washington Quarterly* 35:2 (Spring 2012): [https://csis.org/files/publication/TWQ\\_12Spring\\_Kroenig\\_Pavel.pdf](https://csis.org/files/publication/TWQ_12Spring_Kroenig_Pavel.pdf)

David J. Kilcullen, "Countering Global Insurgency," *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, (August 2005), pp. 597-617

Ömer Taşpınar, "Fighting Radicalism, not 'Terrorism': Root Causes of an International Actor Redefined," *SAIS Review* 29:2 (Summer-Fall, 2009)

Richard Atwood, et al., "Exploiting Disorder: al-Qaeda and the Islamic State," International Crisis Group Special Report, (March 14, 2016):

<https://www.crisisgroup.org/global/exploiting-disorder-al-qaeda-and-islamic-state>

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

**(14) The Future of Global Security (December 5)**

Readings:

National Intelligence Council, *Global Trends: Paradoxes of Power* (January 2017), pp. 1-69

[http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/library/reports/2017/global-trends\\_paradox-of-progress\\_full\\_20170109.pdf](http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/library/reports/2017/global-trends_paradox-of-progress_full_20170109.pdf)

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

[https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/11\\_action\\_plan\\_mgi.pdf](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/11_action_plan_mgi.pdf)

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

Thomas G. Weiss, "Toward a Third Generation of International Institutions: Obama's UN Policy," *The Washington Quarterly* (July 2009), pp. 141-162:

<http://csis.org/files/publication/twg09julyweiss.pdf>

John Steinbruner, "Security Policy and the Question of Fundamental Change," CISSM Working Paper (November 2010):

[http://cissmdev.devcloud.acquia-sites.com/sites/default/files/papers/security\\_policy\\_and\\_the\\_question\\_of\\_fundamental\\_change\\_nov\\_2010a.pdf](http://cissmdev.devcloud.acquia-sites.com/sites/default/files/papers/security_policy_and_the_question_of_fundamental_change_nov_2010a.pdf)

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/>