

# Topics in International Relations: International Security

Political Science 379R Section 2  
Winter semester 2008

Dr. Christopher Jones  
Office: SWKT 792  
Phone: 422-8607  
E-mail: [welshman@byu.edu](mailto:welshman@byu.edu)

MWF 2-2.50  
SWKT 280

Office hours: MTF 10-12

## Course description:

How are we to understand security? Traditionally the term has been synonymous with power, expressed in military might. Since the end of the Cold War in 1991, the term has been broadened to include much more. Furthermore, attention has moved from its almost solitary focus on the security of the state to take in other actors and objects of security. This will be reflected in the much of the course as we discuss a widened security concept and agenda.

We'll begin the class with an historical overview of how we got where we are today, before diving into the widened security agenda. The course will end with a discussion of more traditional security threats and issues.

Given that this is a smaller class, the format for this class will be a mix of lecture and class discussion. You are encouraged to interact. Certainly, the study of international security makes for good, sometimes heated, debate. We will have a few of these, allowing you to voice your opinions as to the merits (or not) of the subject in question.

By the end of the class, you should be better able to understand and interpret current events. The news may never be the same! By studying the ideas and information presented through the class, students can gain both a better understanding of the world around them and a greater capacity to affect the world for good. Furthermore, you should see the course not just as a means to acquire specialised knowledge, but also as an opportunity to develop important academic and life skills, including critical thinking and communication.

For more information on the learning outcome objectives of the Political Science department, visit <http://learningoutcomes.byu.edu>.

## Reading:

My philosophy about reading is that you can never do enough. There is so much interesting literature out there. However, I realize that your joy of reading texts may not be shared. Thus there are primary and other readings designated in the syllabus.

There is one 'required' reading for this course - '*Security: a new framework for analysis*' by Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde - which is available at the BYU Bookstore.

All other readings are available via Blackboard (under Course Material). These are primarily book chapters and journal articles. Where there are several readings for each class, you are not required to read all of them. However, reading several of the articles will give you a fuller understanding of the subject, and you are strongly encouraged to read more of the material. The **primary reading(s)** will be stipulated for each class, listed in the reading schedule by a **P**.

## **Assessment:**

There are four assignments and methods of assessment for this class:

### **1. Current affairs report**      20%

I want you to write a 10-15 page report on a current issue. It does not have to be a war or open conflict, but an issue related to the subject matter of this course, and currently ongoing. You are required to clear your choice of subject with me. At the very least, your choice of subject will depend upon the following requirements:

There are three parts to this assignment: Background, Coverage and Analysis.

- For the **Background**, I want to see some historical understanding of how this conflict or issue came about. This will then flow into your coverage of the issue.

- For the **Coverage** I want you to follow the issue in the news, press, journals, etc. for the duration of the course. Follow how the issue develops and record it. Research! I can suggest links to internet and other sources if desired.

- The final section is an **Analysis** of the issue. Having presented what and how, I want to know why. Here you would apply the readings and class discussions to the issue. What does this issue tell us about security? Whose security are we talking about? Are we talking about it, or is this a forgotten issue? If so, why? Why is nothing being done? What is motivating the nature of the action taken in response to the issue? What does the issue tell us about the nature of international relations?

**This assignment is due on or before the last day of class, M 14 April**

### **2. Critical article reviews:**      20% (4 x 5% )

Four article reviews are required during the course. Each is to be a 3-4 page, double spaced, critical review of one reading. Select a reading from each class block, listed below. Papers are to be submitted to the Political Science Department secretaries, on or before the listed due date. One point will be deducted for each day the paper is late.

Further details on the method for these reviews are provided below.

#### **Due dates:**

CAR 1 - Readings from class 2-8.      Due F 25 January;  
CAR 2 - Readings from class 9-18.      Due T 19 February;  
CAR 3 - Readings from class 20-29.      Due F 13 March;  
CAR 4 - Readings from class 30-40.      Due F 4 April;

### 3. Midterm 20%

W 5 March. Two essay questions, in the normal class period/location.

### 4. Final exam 30%

W 23 April, 7-10 AM. Don't blame me for the scheduling!

The format for the final is three essay questions. The final exam is comprehensive. There is no early exam (other than the fact that the final is at 7 o'clock in the morning!).

### 5. Participation 10%

As this is a smaller class, we will spend time discussing particular issues. Specifically, there are two **debates** scheduled throughout the semester, one on the end of the Cold War and the other on US foreign policy.

For the first debate, I will divide the class into respective groups. Each group will argue one of the several positions on how the Cold War ended. The second debate is more of a 'free-for-all.'

There are a further four **topical debates** scheduled. Here we will discuss questions that you have posed on current issues and events. Questions are to be submitted to me in advance of the debate, so that we can all prepare in good measure. I'll select one or two of the questions to be discussed. Having your question selected does not factor into the participation grade.

These discussions will allow you to express your opinions on the subject matter, and engage in what can be a lively and engaging discussion. I remind you that the spirit of contention is not welcome on these occasions.

Your participation in these debates and discussions is graded. Please read the assigned material and come prepared to contribute. Contributions can of course be made voluntarily, or I will ask you for your comment.

## Grading

Grades are not curved. The score of 94 and above is an A. Any score between a 90 and a 93 is an A-. The score of 87 and above is a B+, 83-86 is a B, and 80 to 82 is a B-. The same system is used for C's and D's. I will happily discuss your grades with you, but make a practice not to amend the grade once given. There is no extra credit. I don't want more work - just better work.

## Guidelines for Article reviews

1. Please put the title and author either on a cover page or at the top of the first page. The cover page does not count towards the page count;
2. I am aware that PLSC 200 has taught one way of citing a page reference. When you write, 'Baylis said that blah, blah, blah (Baylis, 11), you don't need to tell me in the citation reference that it's Baylis, because you've already said it was him. So please cite pages as (page 11) or (p.11).
3. Please use a spelling checker! Read the paper through before you print and submit it.
4. Get your facts right. Spell names and places correctly.
5. 1990s not 1990's.
6. In regard, or with regard NOT plural (regards).
7. Grading: I will deduct -1 point for excessive spelling mistakes; -1 for gross factual errors.

## **Writing a Critical Review**

### **Purpose of a Critical Review**

The critical review is a writing task that asks you to summarize and evaluate a text. The critical review can be of a book, a chapter, or a journal article. Writing the critical review usually requires you to read the selected text in detail and to also read other related texts so that you can present a fair and reasonable evaluation of the selected text.

### **What is meant by critical?**

At university, to be critical does not mean to criticize in a negative manner. Rather it requires you to question the information and opinions in a text and present your evaluation or judgment of the text. To do this well, you should attempt to understand the topic from different perspectives (i.e. read related texts) and in relation to the theories, approaches and frameworks in your course.

### **What is meant by evaluation or judgment?**

Here you decide the strengths and weaknesses of a text. This is usually based on specific criteria. Evaluating requires an understanding of not just the content of the text, but also an understanding of a text's purpose, the intended audience and why it is structured the way it is.

### **What is meant by analysis?**

Analyzing requires separating the content and concepts of a text into their main components and then understanding how these interrelate, connect and possibly influence each other.

## **Structure of a Critical Review**

### **Introduction**

The length of an introduction is usually one paragraph for a journal article review and two or three paragraphs for a longer book review. Include a few opening sentences that announce the author(s) and the title, and briefly explain the topic of the text. Present the aim of the text and summarize the main finding or key argument. Conclude the introduction with a brief statement of your evaluation of the text. This can be a positive or negative evaluation or, as is usually the case, a mixed response.

### **Summary**

Present a summary of the key points along with a limited number of examples. You can also briefly explain the author's purpose/intentions throughout the text and you may briefly describe how the text is organised. The summary should only make up about a third of the critical review.

### **Critique**

The critique should be a balanced discussion and evaluation of the strengths, weakness and notable features of the text. Remember to base your discussion on specific criteria. Good reviews also include other sources to support your evaluation (remember to reference).

You can choose how to sequence your critique. Here are some examples to get you started:

- Most important to least important conclusions you make about the text;
- If your critique is more positive than negative, then present the negative points first and the positive last;
- If your critique is more negative than positive, then present the positive points first and the negative last;

- If there are both strengths and weakness for each criterion you use, you need to decide overall what your judgment is. For example, you may want to comment on a key idea in the text and have both positive and negative comments. You could begin by stating what is good about the idea and then concede and explain how it is limited in some way. While this example shows a mixed evaluation, overall you are probably being more negative than positive;
- In long reviews, you can address each criterion you choose in a paragraph, including both negative and positive points. For very short critical reviews (one page or less) where your comments will be briefer, include a paragraph of positive aspects and another of negative;
- You can also include recommendations for how the text can be improved in terms of ideas, research approach; theories or frameworks used can also be included in the critique section.

### **Conclusion**

This is usually a very short paragraph.

- Restate your overall opinion of the text;
- Briefly present recommendations;
- If necessary some further qualification or explanation of your judgment can be included. This can help your critique sound fair and reasonable.

### **References**

If you have used other sources in you review you should also include a list of references at the end of the review.

## **Summarizing and paraphrasing for the critical review**

Summarizing and paraphrasing are essential skills for academic writing and in particular, the critical review. To summarize means to reduce a text to its main points and its most important ideas. The length of your summary for a critical review should only be about one quarter to one third of the whole critical review. The best way to summarize is to:

1. Scan the text. Look for information that can be deduced from the introduction, conclusion and the title and headings. What do these tell you about the main points of the article?
2. Locate the topic sentences and highlight the main points as you read;
3. Reread the text and make separate notes of the main points. Examples and evidence do not need to be included at this stage. Usually they are used selectively in your critique.

Paraphrasing means putting it into your own words. Paraphrasing offers an alternative to using direct quotations in your summary (and the critique) and can be an efficient way to integrate your summary notes. The best way to paraphrase is to:

1. Review your summary notes;
2. Rewrite them in your own words and in complete sentences;
3. Use reporting verbs and phrases (e.g.; The author describes..., Smith argues that ...);
4. If you include unique or specialist phrases from the text, use quotation marks.

## **Expectations**

You're all adults; you've paid for this class. As much as I will try to provide value for money and time, you will get out as much as you put into this class. I expect you to attend class. I expect you to have read some of the assigned reading prior to each class, and to be able to comment on it upon request. I do not intend this to be a formal lecture series – ask questions! If we take the whole class answering your questions about the topic for that day, and have an engaging class discussion, that's fine by me! In fact, I'd prefer that to me talking. I expect you to participate in class.

### **Honor code:**

In keeping with the principles of the BYU Honor Code, students are expected to be honest in all of their academic work. Academic honesty means, most fundamentally, that any work you present as your own must in fact be your own work and not that of another. Always provide references to the sources of your ideas and data, and never reprint large pieces of published material without using appropriate punctuation marks (quotation marks or, for more than a few lines of cited text, indentation). This applies to material you find on the Web as well as traditional published material. Violations of this principle may result in a failing grade in the course and additional disciplinary action by the university.

Students are also expected to adhere to the Dress and Grooming Standards. Adherence demonstrates respect for yourself and others and ensures an effective learning and working environment. It is the university's expectation that each student will abide by all Honor Code standards. Please call the Honor Code Office at 422-2847 if you have questions about those standards.

### **Preventing Sexual Discrimination or Harassment**

Sexual discrimination or harassment (including student-to-student harassment) is prohibited both by the law and by Brigham Young University policy. If you feel you are being subjected to sexual discrimination or harassment, please bring your concerns to the professor. Alternatively, you may lodge a complaint with the Equal Employment Office (D-240C ASB) or with the Honor Code Office (4440).

### **Students with Disabilities**

If you have a disability that may affect your performance in this course, you should get in touch with the office of Services for Students with Disabilities (1520 WSC). This office can evaluate your disability and assist the professor in arranging for reasonable accommodations.

## Schedule:

#	DATE	SUBJECT
1	M 7 JAN	<b>Introduction to the course</b>
2	W 9 JAN	<b>Origins of the Cold War</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Anne Deighton, 1996, 'The Cold War in Europe 1945-47: Three approaches,' Chapter 4 in Ngaire Woods, <i>Explaining International Relations since 1945</i>; <b>P</b></li><li>- Geir Lundestad, 2000, 'How (not) to study the origins of the Cold War,' Chapter 3 in Odd Arne Westad, <i>Reviewing the Cold War</i>;</li><li>- Antonio Varsori, 2000, 'Reflection on the origins of the Cold War,' Chapter 13 in Odd Arne Westad, <i>Reviewing the Cold War</i>.</li></ul>
3	F 11 JAN	<b>US Cold War policy: Containment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- P.M.H. Bell, 2001, Chapter 4; <b>P</b></li><li>- George Kennan, 1946, 'The source of Soviet conduct,' <i>Foreign Affairs</i>, Vol. 25 No. 1; <b>P</b></li><li>- NSC 68: <i>United States Objectives and Programs for National Security</i>, Chapters 1-4, 9 and Conclusions;</li><li>- John Lewis Gaddis, 1992, <i>The United States and the end of the Cold War</i>, Chapter 2.</li></ul>
4	M 14 JAN	<b>Soviet Cold War policy: Brezhnev to Sinatra</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- P.M.H. Bell, 2001, Chapter 6; <b>P</b></li><li>- Gerasimov, 2005, 'From Brezhnev Doctrine to Sinatra Doctrine,' <i>Demokratizatsiya</i>, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 289-297; <b>P</b></li><li>- Mark Kramer, 1996, 'The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: Spheres of influence,' in Ngaire Woods, <i>Explaining International Relations since 1945</i>, Chapter 5;</li><li>- Csaba Bekes, 2001, 'The 1956 Revolution and world politics,' in Lori Lyn Bogle, <i>The Cold War: Hot Wars of the Cold War</i>, Volume 3;</li><li>- Istvan Vida, 2001, 'Janos Kadar and the Czechoslovak crisis of 1968,' in Lori Lyn Bogle, <i>The Cold War: Hot Wars of the Cold War</i>, Volume 3.</li></ul>
5	W 16 JAN	<b>Cuban missile crisis</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- P.M.H. Bell, 2001, Chapter 7; <b>P</b></li><li>- John Lewis Gaddis, <i>We now know: Rethinking Cold War history</i>, Chapter 9; <b>P</b></li><li>- Philip Brenner, 2001, 'Cuba and the missile crisis,' in Lori Lyn Bogle, <i>The Cold War: Hot Wars of the Cold War</i>, Volume 3;</li><li>- Aleksandr Fursenko, 2001, 'Soviet intelligence and the Cuban missile crisis,' in Lori Lyn Bogle, <i>The Cold War: Hot Wars of the Cold War</i>, Volume 3.</li></ul>
6	F 18 JAN	<b>Suez crisis</b>
7	W 23 JAN	<b>Topical debate #1</b>

- 8 F 25 JAN **Détente**  
 - Jussi Hanhimäki, 2000, 'Ironies and turning points: Détente in perspective,' Chapter 15 in Odd Arne Westad, *Reviewing the Cold War*.
- 9 M 28 JAN **Nuclear weapons and strategy during the Cold War**
- 10 W 30 JAN **Arms control and disarmament**  
 - Ken Booth, 1987, 'Disarmament and Arms Control,' in John Baylis et al (eds.), *Contemporary Strategy: Volume 1*, pp. 140-186; **P**  
 - Paul H. Nitze, 'The objectives of arms control';  
 - James H. Wyllie, 1991, 'Arms control and the quest for international security,' Chapter 8 in Ronald Barston, *International Politics since 1945*;  
 - Matthew Evangelista, 2004, 'Turning points in Arms Control,' in Richard Hermmann and Richard Ned Lebow, *Ending the Cold War: Interpretations, Causation and the study of International Relations*. **P**
- 11 F 1 FEB **The 'ash heap of history'**  
 - P.M.H. Bell, 2001, Chapter 17;  
 - John Lewis Gaddis, 2005, *The Cold War: A new history*, Chapters 6 and 7.
- 12 M 4 FEB **End of the Cold War: debate prep.**  
 - William Wohlforth, 1994, 'Realism and the end of the Cold War,' *International Security*, Vol. 19 No. 3;  
 - Richard Ned Lebow et al, 1995, 'Realism and the end of the Cold War,' *International Security*, Vol. 20 No. 2;  
 - Michael Doyle, 1995, 'Liberalism and the end of the Cold War,' in Richard Ned Lebow and Thomas Risse-Kappen, *International relations theory and the end of the Cold War*, Chapter 4;  
 - Thomas Risse-Kappen, 1995, 'Ideas do not float freely: transnational coalitions, domestic structures and the end of the Cold War,' in Richard Ned Lebow and Thomas Risse-Kappen, *International relations theory and the end of the Cold War*, Chapter 8;  
 - Richard Ned Lebow, 1995, 'The long peace, the end of the Cold War, and the failure of Realism,' in Richard Ned Lebow and Thomas Risse-Kappen, *International relations theory and the end of the Cold War*, Chapter 2;  
 - Archie Brown, 2004, 'Gorbachev and the end of the Cold War,' in Richard Hermmann and Richard Ned Lebow, *Ending the Cold War: Interpretations, Causation and the study of International Relations*;  
 - Robert D. English, 2003, 'The Road(s) not taken: Causality and contingency in analysis of the Cold War's end,' in Wohlforth, *Cold War Endgame*, Chapter 7;  
 - Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth, 2000, 'Power, globalization and the end of the Cold War,' *International Security*, Vol. 25 No. 3;  
 - Kenneth Oye, 1995, 'Explaining the end of the Cold War: Morphological and behavioural adaptations to the nuclear peace?' in Richard Ned Lebow and Thomas Risse-Kappen, *International relations theory and the end of the Cold War*, Chapter 3.
- 13 W 6 FEB **Debate: End of the Cold War**

- 14 F 8 FEB **End of the Cold War: implications for international security**
- Charles Kegley, Jr. and Gregory Raymond, 1992, 'Must we fear a post-Cold War multipolar system?' *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 573-585;
  - Craig Murphy and Thomas Weiss, 1999, 'International peace and security at a multilateral moment: What we seem to know, what we don't, and why,' *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 116-141;
  - Ken Booth, 1991, 'War, security and strategy: towards a doctrine for stable peace,' Chapter 14 in Ken Booth, *New thinking about strategy and international security*; **P**
  - John Lewis Gaddis, 1992, *The United States and the end of the Cold War*, Chapter 11.
- 15 M 11 FEB **What is international security?**
- Bill McSweeney, 1999, 'The Meaning of Security,' in Bill McSweeney, *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*, pp. 13-22; **P**
  - Ronnie Lipschutz, 1995, *On Security*, Chapter 1;
  - Barry Buzan, 1991, 'Is international security possible?' Chapter 1 in Ken Booth, *New thinking about strategy and international security*. **P**
- 16 W 13 FEB **The threat agenda**
- Johan Eriksson & Erik Noreen, 2001, *Setting the agenda of threats: an explanatory model*;
  - Johan Eriksson, 2001, 'Towards a theory of threat politics,' Chapter 10 in Eriksson et al, *Threat Politics*;
  - Ole Waever, 1995, 'Securitization and desecuritization,' Chapter 3 in Ronnie Lipschutz, *On Security*. **P**
- 17 F 15 FEB **Security: Traditional voices**
- Barry Buzan et al, 1998, 'The military sector,' chapter 3 in *Security: A new framework for analysis*; **P**
  - Stephen M. Walt, 1991. 'The Renaissance of Security Studies,' *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 211-39.
- 18 T (M) 19 FEB **Security: broadening the agenda**
- Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams 1996, 'Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods,' *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol. 40, No. 2. pp. 229-254;
  - Sarah Tarry, 1999, 'Deepening ' and 'Widening': An Analysis of Security Definitions in the 1990s,' *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*. **P**
- 19 W 20 FEB **Topical debate #2**
- 20 F 22 FEB **Alternate voices: Feminist thinking on security**
- Jill Steans, 2004, *Gender and International Relations: An introduction*, Chapter 5;
  - J. Ann Tickner, 1995, 'Revisioning security,' Chapter 8 in Ken Booth and Steve Smith, *International relations theory today*; **P**
  - Jill Steans, 2004, *Gender and International Relations: An introduction*, Chapter 1.

- 21 M 25 FEB **Alternate voices: Human security**  
 - Roland Paris, 2001, 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?' *International Security*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 87-102; **P**  
 - Gary King and Christopher Murray, 2002, 'Rethinking Human Security,' *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 116 No. 4, pp. 585-610;  
 - Mohammed Nuruzzaman, 2006, 'Paradigms in conflict: the contested claims of human security, critical theory and feminism,' *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 285-303.
- 22 W 27 FEB **Alternate voices: Political security**  
 - Barry Buzan et al, 1998, 'The political sector,' chapter 7 in *Security: A new framework for analysis*.
- 23 F 29 FEB **Alternate voices: Environmental security**  
 - Barry Buzan et al, 1998, 'The environmental sector,' chapter 4 in *Security: A new framework for analysis*. **P**  
 - Nina Græger, 1996, 'Environmental Security?' *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 109-116;  
 - Karen T. Litfin, 1999, 'Environmental Security in the Coming Century,' in T.V. Paul and John A. Hall (eds), *International Order and the Future of Politics*, pp. 328-51.
- 24 M 3 MAR **Alternate voices: Societal security**  
 - Barry Buzan et al, 1998, 'The societal sector,' chapter 6 in *Security: A new framework for analysis*.
- 25 W 5 MAR **MIDTERM**
- 26 F 7 MAR **Topical debate #3**
- 27 M 10 MAR **C-ing security**  
 - Christopher Jones, 'Common Security';  
 - Christopher Jones, 'Cooperative Security'; **P**  
 - Kim Nossal, 1995, 'Seeing Things? The Adornment of 'Security' in Australia and Canada,' *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 49 No. 1.
- 28 W 12 MAR **Order and society**  
 - Hedley Bull, 1977, chapters 3 and 4 in *The Anarchical society*;  
 - Robert Jackson, 1995, 'The political theory of International Society,' Chapter 5 in Booth and Smith, *International Relations Theory Today*.
- 29 F 13 MAR **Humanitarian intervention**  
 - Nicholas Wheeler, 2000, *Saving Strangers*, Chapter 1. **P**  
 - Nicholas Wheeler & Alex Bellamy, 2005, 'Humanitarian intervention in world politics,' Chapter 25 in Baylis and Smith, *Globalization of World politics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition; **P**  
 - Nicholas Wheeler & Justin Morris, 1996, 'Humanitarian intervention and state practice at the end of the Cold War,' Chapter 7 in Rick Fawn and Jeremy Larkins (eds.), *International society after the Cold War: Anarchy and order reconsidered*.

- 30 M 17 MAR **Just War**  
 - Brian Orend, 2005, 'War,' *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*; **P**  
 - Mervyn Frost, 2004, 'Ethics and War: Beyond Just War Theory';  
 - Nick Fotion, 2005, 'Applying Just War theories to wars involving terrorism,' Chapter 2 in W. Smit (ed.), *Just War and Terrorism: The end of the Just War concept?*
- 31 W 19 MAR **Post Cold War arms: landmines**  
 - Shannon K. Mitchell, 2004, 'Death, disability, displaced persons and development: The case of landmines in Bosnia and Herzegovina,' *World Development*, Vol. 32 No. 12, pp. 2105–2120; **P**  
 - Bryan McDonald, 2004, 'The global landmine crisis in the 1990s,' Chapter 2 in Richard Matthew et al, *Landmines and Human security: International politics and war's hidden legacy*.
- 32 F 21 MAR **Post Cold War arms: small arms**
- 33 M 24 MAR **Post Cold War arms: WMD**  
 - Nikolai Sokov, 2002, 'Why do states rely on nuclear weapons? The case of Russia and beyond,' *The Nonproliferation Review*; **P**  
 - David Krieger, 2005, 'Why nations go nuclear';  
 - Darryl Howlett, 2005, 'Nuclear proliferation,' Chapter 22 in Baylis and Smith, *Globalization of World politics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition; **P**  
 - Scott Sagan, 1994, 'The perils of proliferation: Organization theory, Deterrence Theory, and the spread of nuclear weapons,' *International Security*, Vol. 18 No. 4.
- 34 W 26 MAR **Nuclear weapons in the 21st century**  
 - Michael Mazarr, 1995, 'Going just a little nuclear: Nonproliferation lessons from North Korea,' *International Security*, Vol. 20 No. 2;  
 - Keir Leiber, 2006, 'The end of MAD? The nuclear dimension of US primacy,' *International Security*, Vol. 30 No. 4.
- 35 F 28 MAR **Topical debate #4**
- 36 M 31 MAR **Civilizational conflict**  
 - Samuel P. Huntington, 1993, 'The Clash of Civilizations?' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72 No. 3, pp. 22-49;  
 - Andrej Tuscisny, 2005, 'Civilizational conflicts: More frequent, longer, and bloodier?' *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 485–498. **P**
- 37 W 2 APR **Terrorism 1: history and types**  
 - Cindy Combs, 2003, 'An idea whose time has come,' Chapter 1 in Combs, *Terrorism in the Twenty-first century*;  
 - Cindy Combs, 2003, 'Not a modern phenomenon,' Chapter 2 in Combs, *Terrorism in the Twenty-first century*.

- 38 F 4 APR **Terrorism 2: organisation**  
 - Cindy Combs, 2003, 'Terrorism, Inc.,' Chapter 6 in Combs, *Terrorism in the Twenty-first century*;  
 - James D. Kiras, 2005, 'Terrorism and globalization,' Chapter 21 in Baylis and Smith, *Globalization of World politics*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition.
- 39 M 7 APR **Roots of US foreign policy**  
 - Zachary Selden, 2004, 'Neoconservatives and the American mainstream,' *Policy Review*; **P**  
 - G. John Ikenberry, 1999, 'Why export democracy? The 'Hidden grand strategy' of American foreign policy,' *The Wilson Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No.2; **P**  
 - Christopher Layne, 2006, *The peace of illusions: American grand strategy from 1940 to the present*, Chapter 6;  
 - Jack Snyder, 2006, 'The Crusade of Illusions,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85 No. 4;  
 - John Lewis Gaddis, 2005, 'Grand strategy in the Second Term,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 84 No. 1.
- 40 W 9 APR **Not all Americans now**  
 - Robert Kagan, 2002, 'Power and Weakness,' *Policy Review*; **P**  
 - John Van Oudenaren, 2004, 'Unipolar versus unilateral,' *Policy Review*; **P**  
 - Robert Kagan, 'America and the World: The crisis of legitimacy'; *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 65-87; **P**  
 - William Drozdiak, 2005, 'The North Atlantic Drift,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 84 No. 1;  
 - Walter Russell Mead, 2006, 'Through Our Friends' Eyes,' *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85 No. 3.
- 41 F 11 APR **Debate: US foreign policy**
- 42 M 14 APR **Last day of class: Q & A review**