

International Security (PLIT-10019)

Politics Honours
School of Social and Political Studies
University of Edinburgh

2011 Semester 1

COURSE GUIDE

This version: 16 September 2011

Course Convenor
Dr. Dominic Johnson

Lecturers
Dr. Dominic Johnson
Dr. Juliet Kaarbo

CONTENTS

Aims and Objectives	2
Intended Learning Objectives/Outcomes	2
Course Staff	2
Teaching Arrangements	3
Lecture and Seminar Times	3
WebCT	3
Lecture Schedule	4
Recommended Books	6
Week 1. Introduction (DJ)	8
Week 2. The Changing Nature of War (DJ)	9
Week 3: Nuclear Strategy & WMD Proliferation (JK)	11
Week 4. Winning and Losing Modern Wars (DJ)	14
Week 5. International Terrorism (DJ)	15
Week 6. Rising China & Global Justice (Guest Lecturer: Prof. Ian Holliday)	17
Week 7. International Interventions (JK)	18
Week 8. Perceptions and Misperceptions (DJ)	22
Week 9: Decision-Making and Domestic Politics in Security Policies (JK)	23
Week 10: Thinking Analytically About International Security (JK)	25
Appendix A—Tutorial Assessment Criteria	26
Appendix B—Policy Brief Feedback Form	27
Appendix C—SSPS Common Essay Marking Descriptors	28

Aims and Objectives

This course provides a broad conceptual framework for understanding and analyzing the main challenges to international security, and for assessing the appropriate policy responses. This includes an assessment of how the main theories of International Relations provide insights into international security and the conditions for war and peace. We will examine the role and future of international and regional security institutions along with the policies of key states. The course will address the implications of 9/11 and the emergence of the so-called “new” security agenda, including weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, insurgency, and resources.

Intended Learning Objectives/Outcomes

By the end of this course you should have:

- An understanding of some of the major debates in international security.
- A good intellectual grasp of many of the most critical challenges to international security
- The ability to apply International Relations theories to specific empirical issues.
- Transferable skills such as analytical thinking and communication skills.

Course Staff

Dr. Dominic Johnson (Course Convenor and Co-Lecturer)

Room 4.24

Chrystal Macmillan Building

15A George Square

Edinburgh EH8 9LD

dominic.johnson@ed.ac.uk

Office hours: Thursdays 1pm - 3pm in Meeting Room 4 (CMB 4th floor).

Dr. Juliet Kaarbo (Co-Lecturer)

Room 4.21

Chrystal Macmillan Building

J.Kaarbo@ed.ac.uk

Office hours: Tuesdays 1:30pm - 3pm or by appointment.

Hilary Cornish (Tutor)

Room 4.16

Chrystal Macmillan Building

h.a.cornish@sms.ed.ac.uk

Office hours: Tuesdays 10am – 12pm (drop in or email for a specific time within those hours).

Maggie Dwyer (Tutor)

Room TBC

Chrystal Macmillan Building

M.Dwyer@sms.ed.ac.uk

Office hours: Mondays 3pm – 5pm.

Edward Parsons (Tutor)

Room TBC

Chrystal Macmillan Building

ewlparsons@gmail.com

Office hours: Mondays 3pm – 5pm (email to make appointment).

Teaching Arrangements

This course consists of a 1 hour lecture plus a 1 hour tutorial per week. Tutorials take place in the afternoon on the same day as the lecture. You can sign up for a tutorial on webCT.

No tutorial in week 1. The first tutorial will be in week 2.

Lecture and Seminar Times

	TIME	INSTRUCTOR	LOCATION
Lecture	Tuesday 12:10-13:00	Dominic Johnson Juliet Kaarbo	Lecture Theatre 5 Appleton Tower
Seminar 1	Tuesday 14:00-14.50	Edward Parsons	Rm 1.4 22 Buccleuch Place
Seminar 2	Tuesday 15.00-15.50	Edward Parsons	Rm 1.4 22 Buccleuch Place
Seminar 3	Tuesday 16.10-17.00	Hilary Cornish	Rm 1.4 22 Buccleuch Place
Seminar 4	Tuesday 14:00-14.50	Hilary Cornish	Rm 2.01 Geography Bdg
Seminar 5	Tuesday 15.00-15.50	Maggie Dwyer	Rm 2.01 Geography Bdg
Seminar 6	Tuesday 16.10-17.00	Maggie Dwyer	Rm 2.01 Geography Bdg

WebCT

Key readings will be made available on WebCT, although students should become familiar with finding journal articles online. Lecture slides may be uploaded in advance of the lecture in some but not all cases. There will also be documents relating to essay writing, policy brief writing, and feedback.

Please check webCT regularly for these materials and any announcements which may be made about the course. You are also free to voice questions and comments in the discussion forum.

Lecture Schedule

WEEK	DATE	LECTURE
1	20 Sept	Introduction (DJ)
2	27 Sept	The Changing Nature of War (DJ)
3	4 Oct	Nuclear Strategy & WMD Proliferation (JK)
4	11 Oct	Winning and Losing Modern Wars (DJ)
5	18 Oct	International Terrorism (DJ)
6	25 Oct	Rising China & Global Justice (Guest: Prof. Ian Holliday)
7	1 Nov	International Interventions (JK)
8	8 Nov	Perceptions and Misperceptions (DJ)
9	15 Nov	Decision-Making and Domestic Politics in Security Policies (JK)
10	22 Nov	Thinking Analytically About International Security (JK)
11	-	Revision week (no lecture)

Assessment

This course is assessed by:

- 10% Tutorial attendance and participation.
- 40% Policy Brief of up to 1,500 words (Deadline: 25 October 2011).
- 50% Essay of up to 2,500 words (Deadline: 28 November 2011).

There is no exam on this course.

The word limit on all written work is strict, and includes footnotes and in-text citations but excludes the bibliography.

Tutorial Attendance and Participation

The tutorials are designed to give you an opportunity to discuss the readings, share your ideas and debate arguments with other students. Their usefulness is directly proportional to your willingness to prepare and participate actively.

Attendance: You are expected to attend every tutorial, unless you have a very good reason to be absent. Absences should be explained in advance and justified with evidence where appropriate. Note that absence may affect your final grade.

Preparation: You are expected to complete the required reading every week, and to come up with two or three points from the reading for discussion. These will not be handed in and marked, but you may be called on at any point in any week to contribute to the discussion using one of your points. There may sometimes be more specific instructions, found in the tutorial programmes. The required reading is the bare minimum you are expected to do; the more you read, the better the discussion, and the better your essays and policy briefs will be.

Engagement: You are expected to contribute to class discussion by offering ideas and asking questions.

Listening: You are expected to listen when others talk, both in small and large group discussions. Ideally, you will be able to incorporate or build off the ideas of others.

Tutorials will be assessed according to a set of guidelines developed for and implemented on previous courses at Edinburgh (see Appendix A).

Policy Brief

What is a Policy Brief?

The rationale and structure of policy briefs as a teaching tool are set out in an excellent recent paper in the journal *Politics* (Boys & Keating, 2009; posted on WebCT)¹. Although underused in teaching, policy briefs offer a novel training tool and more realistic types of tasks that students may be faced with after university, especially in the domains of politics and international relations. They typically ask for an assessment of and recommendations to deal with a specific challenge, and comprise an executive summary, situation brief, policy options/recommendation and a list of key sources, as would be presented to decision-makers or managers. As such, they require a broader skill set than a regular undergraduate essay. Conventional essays obviously still have their part to play, and this is why we are retaining the essay and have a policy brief as a separate piece of coursework.

The specific Policy Brief assignment will be posted on WebCT nearer the time. It will be assessed in terms of the quality of the research, presentation and policy analysis. You will receive your Policy Brief back with a marksheet on which will be written your mark and a paragraph of constructive comments (see Appendix B).

¹ Keating, Michael F. and James D. Boys, (2009). 'The Policy Brief: Building Practical and Academic Skills in International Relations and Political Science', in *Politics*, 29 (3), pp. 201-208.

Essay

Please answer one of the following questions:

1. How is international security different in the 21st century compared to the 20th century?
2. Is Kenneth Waltz right that, in terms of nuclear weapons, “more may be better”?
3. Given the nature of the contemporary threat of international terrorism, what are the most effective counter-terrorism policies?
4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of securitizing ‘new threats’ such as environmental and health problems and global poverty?
5. Critically assess the evolution of international interventions in the post-Cold War era with reference to theories of international relations.
6. How do perceptions and misperceptions influence international security?
7. How do domestic politics of states influence international security?
8. How do theories of international relations (Realism, Liberalism, etc) differ in their predictions for how states are likely to pursue security?

Rules for Written Coursework

- Submission Guidelines are found at the end of this course guide in [Appendix C](#).
- Coursework over the word limit will lose 5 marks, and the “extra” text may not be marked.
- Coursework will normally be returned within 3 working weeks of their deadlines with both comments and a mark.
- Coursework will be marked according to the SSPS marking descriptors (available in your Politics/IR Honours Handbook and on webCT) – please consult before submitting your essay.
- You will receive your coursework back with a standardised marksheet (also available in your Politics/IR Honours Handbook and on webCT) on which will be written your mark and a paragraph of constructive comments
- The mark for coursework is provisional, since coursework may also be seen by the external examiners and the mark may sometimes be amended.

Students with learning difficulties

Advice, guidance and a range of support materials is available to students with learning difficulties (such as dyslexia). These students should contact—in advance of coursework deadlines—the Disability Office for further information. See the Disability Office’s website: <http://www.disability-office.ed.ac.uk/>. For further information, please see the Politics/International Relations Honours Handbook.

Recommended Books

Books worth purchasing for the whole course are:

- Roland Dannreuther (2007) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda* (Polity).
- John Baylis et al. (2007) *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies 2nd Edition* (Oxford University Press).
- Collins, A. (ed.) (2007) *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Williams, Paul (ed) (2008) *Security Studies: An Introduction*, Routledge

Other books and articles that will be useful throughout the course:

- Michael E. Brown et al (2005), *New Global Dangers: Changing Dimensions of International Security*
- B. Buzan, O. Waever and J de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (1998)
- David Held (et al), *Global Transformations* (1999)
- David Held and A. McGrew, *Global Transformations Reader* (2000)
- Michael Sheehan, *International Security: An Analytical Survey*
- R Wyn-Jones, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, 1999
- Joseph Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts* (2000)
- Snyder, Jack 'One World, Rival Theories', *Foreign Policy*, 145, 2004
- Walt, Stephen 'International Relations: One World, Many Theories', *Foreign Policy*, 110, 1998
- John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (eds), (2008) *The Globalization of World Politics*
- Robert Art and Robert Jervis (eds), *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*
- Chris Brown & Kirsten Ainley (2005) *Understanding International Relations*, Palgrave MacMillan
- Burchill, S., A. Linklater et al (2001 or 2005) *Theories Of International Relations*, London: Palgrave (either edition) (Introduction)
- Doyle, Michael (1997) *Ways of War and Peace*
- Dunne, T, Kurki, M and Smith, S (2007) *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford University Press
- Halliday, Fred, *Rethinking International Relations*
- Hoffmann, Stanely, *World Disorders: Troubled Peace in the post-Cold War Era*
- Jackson, R. & G. Sorensen (2007) *Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford: OUP (3rd edition)
- Kegley, C. and E. Wittkopf (2001) *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*, 8th ed. (Introduction)
- Nye, J. (2000) *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*, New York: Longman
- Woods, N (ed.) (1996), *Explaining International Relations since 1945*

Week 1. Introduction (DJ)

This lecture will introduce the concept of security and its central role in international relations. What is security? How is it achieved? How does it relate to major theories of international relations? What are the most pressing security threats today? Should we conceive of security narrowly, as issues surrounding military threats to the nation-state? Or are all sorts of issues – the environment, migration, international crime and religion, for example – security issues?

The lecture will also go over the structure of the course, teaching arrangements and assessment.

No Tutorial this week.

Suggested Reading

- Dannreuther, R (2007) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda* (Polity). Chapters 1 and 2
- David Baldwin, 'The Concept of Security', *Review of International Studies*, 23:1, 1997
- Baldwin, David A., 'Security Studies and the End of the Cold War', *World Politics*, vol. 48, no. 1, October 1995, pp. 117-141.
- John Baylis et al. (2007) *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies 2nd Edition* (Oxford University Press).
- Michael E. Brown et al (2005), *New Global Dangers: Changing Dimensions of International Security*
- Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for Security Studies* (1991)
- B. Buzan, O. Waever and J de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (1998)
- Collins, A. (ed.) (2007) *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Keith Krause and M. Williams (eds), *Critical Security Studies* 1996
- Paris, Roland, 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?' *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2001, pp. 187-102.
- Rothschild, Emma, 'What is Security?' *Daedalus*, vol. 124, no. 3, Summer 1995, pp. 53-98.
- Michael Sheehan, *International Security: An Analytical Survey*
- Caroline Thomas, *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations* (1987)
- Williams, Paul (ed) (2008) *Security Studies: An Introduction*, Routledge
- R Wyn-Jones, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, 1999

Week 2. The Changing Nature of War (DJ)

Lecture: the causes of the decrease in large-scale interstate war, and the increase in intrastate or civil wars, particularly in the global South. It will provide a framework for thinking about these ‘new wars’, and the problems of insurgency. The possibility of great power politics coming back to the fore in international security—the rise of the EU, China, India, Japan.

Required Reading for Lecture

- Herfried Münkler, *The New Wars*, 2005 ch 1.

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

Further Reading

- More chapters from Munkler.
- Dannreuther, R (2007) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda*, ch 7.
- Colin M. Fleming, ‘New or Old Wars? Debating a Clausewitzian Future’, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 2, (April, 2009), 213-241.
- S N Kalyvas, ‘“New” and “old” Civil wars: A valid Distinction?’, *World Politics* 54:1, 2001.
- Hoffman, F. G. (2009). Hybrid threats: Reconceptualizing the evolving character of modern conflict. *Strategic Forum*, 240, 1-8.
- Mueller, J. 2004 *The Remnants of War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- P Collier, ‘Doing Well out of War: An Economic Perspective’ in Mats Berdal and David Malone (eds.), *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars*
- Toft, M. D. 2003 *The Geography of Ethnic Conflict: Identity, Interests, and the Indivisibility of Territory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Robert D Kaplan, ‘The Coming Anarchy’, *The Atlantic Monthly*, February 1994
- S N Kalyvas, ‘“New” and “old” Civil wars: A valid Distinction?’, *World Politics* 54:1, 2001
- Michael Clarke, ‘War and the New Security Order’, *International Affairs*, vol. 77, no. 3, July 2001
- Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars*, 2001
- Tedd Robert Gurr, ‘Ethnic Warfare on the Wane’, *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 79, no. 3, May/June 2000, pp. 52-64
- Mary Kaldor, *New and Old wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, 1999
- Michael T. Klare, ‘The New Geography of Conflict’, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 80, no. 3, May/June 2001, pp 49-61 (offprint).
- Martin Van Creveld, *The Transformation of War*, 1991
- M L Ross, ‘The Political Economy of the Resource Curse’, *World Politics*, vol 51 January 1999 (e-journal)

On the Political Economy of the New Wars:

- C Cramer, ‘Homo Economicus Goes to War: Methodological Individualism, Rational Choice and the Political Economy of War’, *World Development*, 30:11, 2002
- David Keen, *The Economic Functions of Violence in Civil Wars*, Adelphi Paper, 1998
- M. Berdal and D. Malone, *Greed and Grievance*, 2000

- M Berdal, 'How New are the New Wars? Global Economic Change and the Study of Civil War', *Global Governance*, 9(4), 2003
- K. Ballentine and Jake Sherman, *The Political Economy of Armed Conflict*, 2003
- Philip Le Billon, *Fuelling War: Natural Resources and Armed Conflict*, Adelphi Paper 373, 2005
- Phillipe le Billon, 'The Political Ecology of War: Natural Resources and Armed Conflicts', *Political Geography*, 20(5), 2001
- Phillipe le Billon, 'Angola's Political Economy of War: the Role of Oil and Diamonds, 1975-2000', *African Affairs*, 100(398), 2001
- M. Renner, *The Anatomy of Resource Wars*, 2002
- P Collier, 'The Market for Civil Wars', *Foreign Policy*, May/June 2003

On Human Security:

- Paris, Roland, 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?' *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2001, pp. 187-102.
- Special Edition on Human Security in *Security Dialogue*, 2004
- E Newman and O. Richmond, *The United Nations and Human Security*, 2001
- Commission on Human Security web-site
- A Suhrke, 'Human Security and the Interests of States', *Security Dialogue*, 30(3), 1999
- Y Khong, 'Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?', *Global Governance*, 7(3) 2001
- Human Security Center, *Human Security Report: War and Peace in 21st Century* (online)
- Final Report of the Commission on Human Security, 2003, in www.humansecurity-chs.org
- Tim Dunne, 'We the Peoples: Contending Discourses of Security in Human Rights Theory and Practice', *International Relations*, 18:1, 2004
- J Brunnee and S Toope, 'Human Security: A Blanket Excuse for the Use of Force?' *International Journal*, 2004
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 'Responsibility to Protect', 2003 in www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/iciss-ciise/menu-en.asp
- Kofi Annan, 'We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21st Century', www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/summ.htm pp. 1-7
- Caroline Thomas, 'Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links' *Third World Quarterly*, 22:2, 2001

Week 3: Nuclear Strategy & WMD Proliferation (JK)

The lecture will address different theoretical perspectives on the issue of nuclear deterrence and the extent to which the theory of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) can be said to explain the non-use of nuclear weapons since 1945. It will discuss nuclear proliferation in theory and practice, including both the Cold War nuclear context and post Cold War dynamics.

Required Reading for Lecture

- Dannreuther, R (2007) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda* (Polity). Chapter 10

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

Further Reading

- Annan, Kofi, address on proliferation at Princeton University, 2007: <http://www.un.org/News/oss/sg/stories/AnnanKeySpeeches.asp>
- Braut-Hegghammer, Malfrid (2011) 'Revisiting Osirak: Preventive Attacks and Nuclear Proliferation Risks,' *International Security* 36/1 (Summer): 101-132.
- Butler, Richard, *Fatal Choice: Nuclear Weapons and the Illusion of Missile Defence*
- Campbell, K. M., R. Einhorn, and M. B. Reiss (eds), *The Nuclear Tipping Point: Why States Reconsider their Nuclear Choices*, 2004
- Cirincione, Joseph Jon B. Wolstahl and M. Rajkumar, *Deadly Arsenal: Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Threats*, 2005
- Davis, Malcolm and Colin Gray, 'Weapons of Mass Destruction', in J. Baylis, J. Wirtz et al., *Strategy in the Contemporary World*
- Feinstein, L and Anne-Marie Slaughter, 'A Duty to Prevent', *Foreign Affairs* 83(1), 2004
- Freedman, Lawrence (2003) *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy* 3rd edition (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- George, Alexander and William E. Simons (Eds.) (1994) *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*, 2nd edition. (Boulder CO: Westview Press).
- Glaser, Charles, and Steve Fetter (2005) "Counterforce Revisited: Assessing the Nuclear Posture Review's New Missions" *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 2: 84–126.
- Gray, Colin S *House of Cards: Why Arms Control Must Fail*
- Helfstein, Scott (2010) 'Friends Don't Let Friends Proliferate,' *Political Science Quarterly* 125/2 (Summer): 281-307.
- Hymans, Jacques E.C. (2006) *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation: Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Kapur, S. Paul. (2008) "Ten Years of Instability in a Nuclear South Asia" *International Security*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Fall 2008), pp. 71–94
- Krause, Keith and Andrew Latham, 'Constructing Non-Proliferation and Arms Control' in K Krause and Andrew Latham (ed.) *Culture and Security: Multilateralism, Arms Control and Security Building*, 1999
- Langewiesche, W. (2007) *The Atomic Bazaar: The Rise of Nuclear Poor* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux).

- Lee, S. and S. Hasmi (eds) *Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Levite, Ariel E. (2002/2003) ‘Never Say Never Again: Nuclear Reversal Revisited,’ *International Security* 27/3 (Winter): 59-88.
- Lieber, Keir and Daryle Press (2006) “The End of MAD? The Nuclear Dimension of U.S. Primacy” *International Security* Vol. 30, No. 4: 7–44.
- Levi, Michael A and M. E. O’Hanlon, *The Future of Arms Control*, 2005
- Lutwak, R. (2002) ‘The New Calculus of Pre-emption,’ *Survival* 44/4 (February)
- Montgomery, Alexander H (2005) “Ring in Proliferation: How to Dismantle an Atomic Bomb Network” *International Security* Fall 2005, Vol. 30, No. 2: 153–187.
- Mutimer, David *The Weapons State: Proliferation and the Framing of Security*
- Paul, T V ‘Great Equalisers or Agents of Chaos?: Weapons of Mass Destruction and the Emerging International Order’, in T V Paul and John Hall (eds.), *International Order and Future of World Politics*
- Payne, Keith B. (2008) *The Great American Gamble: Deterrence Theory and Practice from the Cold War to the Twenty-first Century* (Fairfax, VA: National Institute Press).
- Potter, William C. and Gaukhar Mukhatzhanova (2008) “Divining Nuclear Intentions: A Review Essay” *International Security*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 139–169
- Price, R. and N. Tannenwald, ‘Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Taboo’ in P. Katzenstein (ed.), *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*.
- Sagan, Scott and Kenneth Waltz (2003) *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed* chapters 1 and 2
- Sagan, Scott D. (1996/97) “Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb’, 21/3 (Winter): 54-86.
- Sagan, Scott D. (2000) ‘The Commitment Trap: Why the United States Should Not Use Nuclear Threats to Deter Biological and Chemical Weapons Attacks,’ *International Security* 24/4 (Spring): 85-115.
- Sagan, Scott D.(2009)‘The Case for No First Use’, *Survival*, 51:3,163-182
- Schelling, Thomas C. (1966) *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- *SIPRI Yearbook: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (annual publication) (Oxford: OUP).
- Solingen, Etel (2007), *Nuclear Logics: Alternative Paths in East Asia and the Middle East*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press
- Schelling, Thomas, Nobel Prize Lecture, 2005:
http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economics/laureates/2005/schelling-lecture.html
- Tannenwald, Nina (1999) ‘The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Use’, *International Organization* 53(3/Summer): 433-468.
- Walker, William, *Weapons of Mass Destruction and International Order*, Adelphi Paper 370, 2004
- Walker, William 2007 “Nuclear Enlightenment and counter Enlightenment” *International Affairs*, 83:3 (and see the other articles in this special issue)
- Kenneth Waltz, ‘Nuclear Myths and Political Realities’, *American Political Science Review*, 84(3) 1990

Web Sources

- Disarmament Diplomacy – journal of the Acronym Institute, providing in-depth and critical coverage of disarmament negotiations, arms control and international security:
www.acronym.org.uk/dd/index.htm

- The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists – journal on all things nuclear, with reliable data on nuclear arsenals of nuclear states – www.thebulletin.org/
- Federation of American Scientists <http://www.fas.org/index.html>
- Nuclear Age Peace Foundation: <http://www.nuclearfiles.org/>
- <http://nuclearweaponarchive.org/>
- Arms Control Association: <http://www.armscontrol.org>

Week 4. Winning and Losing Modern Wars (DJ)

Lecture: If war has changed, so has the criteria under which it is fought and the goals and objectives of militaries, governments and of the “international community”. How are wars fought, and how is success and failure measured? How does public opinion matter in the causes and consequences of war?

Required Reading for Lecture

- Chapter 1: Johnson, D. D. P. & Tierney, D. R. 2006 *Failing to Win: Perceptions of Victory and Defeat in International Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

Further reading

- One of the case studies from Johnson & Tierney, *Failing to Win*.
- Biddle S (2004) *Military Power: Explaining Victory and Defeat in Modern Battle*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Von Clausewitz C (1997/1832) *On War*. Ware, UK: Wordsworth Classics.
- Scott Gartner (2008) The Multiple Effects of Casualties on Public Support for War: An Experimental Approach. *American Political Science Review*, 102 (1), 95-106.
- Gelpi, C., Feaver, P. D., & Reifler, J. (2005). Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq. *International Security*, 30(3), 7-46.
- Labs E (1997) Beyond victory: offensive realism and the expansion of war aims. *Security Studies* 6: 1-49.
- Mandel R (2006) *The Meaning of Military Victory*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Martel WC (2006) *Victory in War: Foundations of Modern Military Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, DDP & Tierney, D (2007) In the eye of the beholder: victory and defeat in U.S. military operations, pp. 46-76, In: *Understanding Victory and Defeat in Contemporary War*, edited by J. Angstrom and I. Duyvesteyn, London: Routledge.

Week 5. International Terrorism (DJ)

The lecture will discuss the problems of defining and categorising terrorism. It will outline the argument that there is a new form of terrorism, requiring new strategies of counter-terrorism, before briefly considering the “war on terror” in theory and practice. It will also explore links and differences to insurgency.

Special Homework: Please complete an anonymous experimental research survey. Class results will be presented and discussed during next week’s lecture (details to come).

Required Reading for Lecture

- Dannreuther (2007) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda*, Ch 9

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

Further Reading

- Adam Roberts, ‘The War on Terror in Historical Perspective’, *Survival* 17:2, 2005.
- Scott Atran, ‘The Moral Logic and Growth of Suicide Terrorism’, *Washington Quarterly* (29:2) 2006: 122-47.
- Pape, R. A. 2003 The strategic logic of suicide terrorism. *American Political Science Review* 97, 343-361.
- Atran, S., Axelrod, R., & Davis, R. (2007). Sacred barriers to conflict resolution. *Science*, 317, 1039-1040.
- Bruce Hoffman, “Terrorism: Trends and Prospects,” Ch 2 in Ian Lesser, *Countering the New Terrorism*, 1998 (found also in www.rand.org).
- John Mueller (2006) Is There Still a Terrorist Threat?: The Myth of the Omnipresent Enemy, *Foreign Affairs* September/October.
- Ian Lesser, *Countering the New Terrorism*, 1998 (found also in www.rand.org) ch.2.
- Olivier Roy, *Globalised Islam: the Search for a New Ummah* ch. 1.
- Marc Sageman, *Understanding Terror Networks*, 2004 ch. 5.
- F. Gerges, *The Far Enemy: Why Jihad Went Global*, 2005
- G. Kepel, *Jihad: the Trail of Political Islam*, 2002
- G. Kepel, *The War for Muslim Minds: Islam and the West*
- D. Benjamin and S. Simon, *The Age of Sacred Terror*, 2002
- M Jurgensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God*, 2000
- P. Berman, *Terror and Liberalism*, 2003
- J. B. Elshaint, *Just War Against Terror* 2003
- M. Ignatieff, *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in the Age of Terror*, 2004
- J Baylis, J Wirtz et al, *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, ch. 9
- Bruce Hoffmann, *Inside Terrorism*
- Jessica Stern, *The Ultimate Terrorists*

- Thayer, B. A., & Hudson, V. M. (2010). Sex and the Shaheed: Insights from the Life Sciences on Islamic Suicide Terrorism. *International Security*, 34(4), 37-62.
- Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism versus Democracy: the Liberal State Response*, 2001
- R D Howard and D. L Sawyer, *Terrorism and Counterterrorism: Understanding the New Security Environment*
- Jonathan Stephenson, 'Counter-terrorism: Containment and Beyond', Adelphi Paper, No. 367, 2004
- Max Abrahms, 'Why Terrorism does not Work', *International Security* 31:2, 2006
- A. K. Cronin, 'How al-Qaeda ends: the Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups', *International Security* 31:1 2006
- Walter Lacquer, *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- Adrian Guleke, *The Age of Terrorism and the International Political System* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998)
- Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response* (London: Frank Cass, 2001)
- J Arquila and D Ronfeldt, *Networks and Netwars*, 2001. Also www.rand.org.

Week 6. Rising China & Global Justice (Guest Lecturer: Prof. Ian Holliday)

This week we are lucky to have a special guest lecture by Prof. Ian Holliday, Dean of Social Sciences and Professor of Political Science at The University of Hong Kong. He has previously served as Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences at City University of Hong Kong, and taught at the University of Manchester and New York University. Ian was educated at the University of Oxford (DPhil, MPhil) and the University of Cambridge (MA, BA). His current research interests focus on Myanmar, and embrace problems of political reform inside the country, and human security challenges facing migrants outside the country. Ian was a founding editor of the journal *Party Politics*, and is the relaunch editor of the journal *Contemporary Politics*.

Week 7. International Interventions (JK)

The lecture will focus on how multinational military intervention has evolved since the end of the Cold War. Again, theoretical perspectives will be integrated into the lecture, with Realist scepticism contrasted with Liberal optimism about the prospects for achieving security through military interventions. Constructivist and Critical perspectives will also be integrated to assess the evolution of international interventions and the prospects of democratization, peacebuilding, and statebuilding efforts.

Required Reading for Lecture

- Dannreuther, Roland (2007) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda*, Chapter 8

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

Further Reading

On UN Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Intervention:

- Abramowitz, Morton and Pickering, Thomas (2008) “Making Intervention Work” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87 Issue 5, p100-108
- Bellamy, Alex J. (2003) 'Humanitarian responsibilities and interventionist claims in international society', *Review of International Studies*, 29(3), 321-340
- Arbour, Louise (2008) ‘The responsibility to protect as a duty of care in international law and practice’ *Review of International Studies*, 34, 445-58
- Ayub, F. and S. Kouvo (2008) ‘Righting the Course? Humanitarian Intervention, the War on Terror and the Future of Afghanistan,’ *International Affairs* 84 (4), 641–657
- Bellamy, Alex (2008) “The Responsibility to Protect” ch 28 in Williams, P (ed) *Security Studies: An Introduction*
- Bellamy, Alex J. (2009) ‘Realizing the Responsibility to Protect’, *International Studies Perspectives*, 10(2), 111-128
- Bellamy, Alex, Paul William and Stuart Griffin, *Understanding Peacekeeping*, 2004
- Bellamy, Alex J. (2003). 'Humanitarian responsibilities and interventionist claims in international society'. *Review of International Studies*. 29(3), 321-340.
- Bellamy and Williams (2005) “The Responsibility to Protect and the Crisis in Darfur” *Security Dialogue* 36:1, 27-48
- Bellamy, A (2008) ‘The Responsibility to Protect and the Problem of Military Intervention’, *International Affairs* 84 (4), 615–639 [e-journal]
- Bellamy, A , et al (2010) *Understanding Peacekeeping*, Oxford: Polity Press
- Belloni, Robert “The trouble with humanitarianism” *Review of International Studies* (2007), 33, 451–474
- Berdal, (Mats (2004) ‘The United Nations after Iraq’, *Survival*, 46:3
- Brunnee, J and Toope, S.J. (2006) ‘Norms, Institutions and UN Reform: The Responsibility to Protect’, *Journal of Law and International Relations*, 2, 121-137
- Chesterman, Simon (2001). *Just War or Just Peace? Humanitarian intervention and international law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- De Waal, (2007) “Darfur and the Failure of Responsibility to Protect” [*International Affairs*, Vol. 83, Issue 6, pp. 1039-1054](#)
- Duffield, Mark (2001) *Global Governance and the New Wars*, London, Zed Books, ch 2
- W F Durch, *UN Peacekeeping, American Politics and the Uncivil Wars of the 1990s*
- Etzioni, Amitai (2005) “Genocide Prevention in the New Global Architecture” *British Journal of Politics and IR*, 7, 469–484
- Finnemore, M *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force* (2003)
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) ‘International Norm Dynamics and Political Change,’ *International Organization*, vol.52, no.4 (Autumn): 887-917
- Fortna, V.P. (2004) “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War,” *International Studies Quarterly* 48:269-292
- Holzgrefe, J. and Keohane, R. (2003) *Humanitarian Intervention, Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas*
- Kurth, James (2006) “Humanitarian Intervention After Iraq: Legal Ideals vs. Military Realities” *Orbis*, (winter).
- Lang, Anthony F. (Ed.) (2003) *Just Intervention* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press).
- N. S. MacFarlane, *Intervention in Contemporary World Politics*, Adelphi Paper 2002
- Macklem, P (2008) ‘Humanitarian Intervention and the Distribution of Sovereignty in International Law’, *Ethics and International Affairs*, 22 (4), 369-393
- Mayall, J. (1996), *New Interventionism, 1991-1994: United Nations Experience in Cambodia, former Yugoslavia and Somalia* Cambridge: CUP.
- Orend, B. (1999) ‘Crisis in Kosovo: A Just Use of Force?’ *Politics*, 19: 3: pp125-130
- Roberts, A (2003) “Law and the use of force after Iraq” *Survival*, 45, 2 pp 31-56
- Roberts, A (2002) “The Price of Protection” *Survival*, 44, 4, pp 157-161
- Webber, Mark (2009) “Kosovo: A Recapitulation” *International Affairs* 85: 3, 447–459
- Weiss, Thomas G. (2007) *Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas Into Action* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Wheeler, H.J. and Dunne, T.(2001) ‘East Timor and the New Interventionism’ *International Affairs* 77:4
- Wheeler, N. (2000) *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*, Oxford: OUP.

Peacebuilding

- Ashdown, Paddy (2007) *Swords and ploughshares : bringing peace to the 21st century*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson
- Ayoob, M, (2004) “Third World Perspectives on Humanitarian Intervention and International Administration” *Global Governance*, 10: 1, 99-118 (and the other articles in this edition of *Global Governance*)
- Ayub, Fatima and Sari Kouvo (2008) “Righting the course? Humanitarian intervention, the war on terror and the future of Afghanistan,” *International Affairs* 84: 4 641–657
- Barnett, Michael (1997) ‘Bringing in the New World Order: Liberalism, Legitimacy and the United Nations’, *World Politics*, 49(4).
- Barnett, Michael (2006) ‘Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States after War’, *International Security*, 30 (4), 87–112
- Bellamy, Alex J (2008) “The responsibilities of victory: Jus Post Bellum and the Just War” *Review of International Studies* 34, 601–625

- Caplan, R (2002) 'A New Trusteeship? The International Administration of War-Torn Territories', *Adelphi Paper No. 341*
- Chandler, D. (ed) (2009) *Statebuilding and Intervention: Policies, practices and paradigms*. Routledge
- Chesterman, Simon *You, the People: the United Nations, Transitional Administration and State Building*, 2004
<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/public/content/politicalscience/9780199263486/toc.html>
- Cousens, Elizabeth M, Chetan Kumar, with Karin Wermester (2001) *Peacebuilding as politics : cultivating peace in fragile societies*, Boulder ; London : Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Debrix, François (1999) *Re-Envisioning Peacekeeping: Simulation, the UN, and the Mobilization of Ideology* (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press).
- Dobbins, James (2008) 'Europe's Role in Nation Building', *Survival*, 50:3,83 — 110
- Doyle, M.W. and N. Sambanis (eds) (2006) *Making War & Building Peace*, Princeton University Press
- Englebert, Pierre and Denis M. Tull (2008) "Postconflict Reconstruction in Africa: Flawed Ideas about Failed States" *International Security*, 32:4
- Etzioni, (2004) 'A Self-Restrained Approach to Nation-Building by Foreign Powers', *International Affairs*, 80(1)
- Evans, Mark (2008) "Balancing Peace, Justice and Sovereignty in Jus Post Bellum: The Case of 'Just Occupation'" *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 2008 36: 533-554
- Fukuyama, Francis (2004) *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*
- Heathershaw, John (2008) "Unpacking the Liberal Peace: The Dividing and Merging of Peacebuilding Discourses" *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 2008 36: 597-621
- Ignatieff, M (2003) *Empire Lite: Nation Building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan*, Vintage
- Jeong, Ho-Won (2005) *Peacebuilding in postconflict societies : strategy and process*, Boulder, Colo. ; London : Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Kaufman, Edy, Walid Salem, and Juliette Verhoeven (eds) *Bridging the divide : peacebuilding in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict*, Boulder, Colo.; London: L. Rienner
- Lischer, 'Sarah Kenyon (2003) Collateral Damage: Humanitarian Assistance as a Cause of Conflict' *International Security* 28:1 (Summer).
- May, H-W J (2004) *Peacebuilding in Postconflict Societies: Strategy and Process* (Lynne Rienner)
- McMahon, Patrice C and Jon Western (2009) "The Death of Dayton" *Foreign Affairs*; Sep/Oct2009, Vol. 88 Issue 5, p69-83
- Meyer, Jörg (2008) "The Concealed Violence of Modern Peace(-Making)" *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 2008 36: 555-574.
- Miall, Hugh, Oliver Ramsbotham, Tom Woodhouse (eds) (2005) *Contemporary conflict resolution : the prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts, second edition*, Cambridge: Polity, ch 9
- Paris, Roland (1997) "Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism," [International Security](#), Vol. 22, No. 2 (Autumn, 1997), pp. 54-89
- Paris, Roland (2002) "International peacebuilding and the 'mission civilisatrice'" *Review of International Studies* 28:4:637-656
- Paris, Roland (2004) *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil War*, 2004

- Paris, R. and T.D. Sisk (2009) *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations*
- Richmond, Oliver P (2009) “A post-liberal peace: Eirenism and the everyday,” *Review of International Studies* (2009), 35, 557–580
- Schmidt, John R. (2008) “Can Outsiders Bring Democracy to Post-Conflict States?” *Orbis*, Winter 2008

Web Sources and Influential Reports

- UN Department of Peacekeeping – www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/
- The UN Peacebuilding Commission: <http://www.un.org/peace/peacebuilding/>
- Special issue of Disarmament Forum on the Peacebuilding Commission: http://www.unidir.ch/bdd/fiche-periodique.php?ref_periodique=1020-7287-2007-2-en
- The UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan: <http://unama.unmissions.org/>
- The Brahimi Report 1999 can be found on www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, ‘Responsibility to Protect’, 2003 in www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/iciss-ciise/menu-en.asp
- UN High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, ‘A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility’, 2004, <http://www.un.org/secureworld/>
- United States Institute of Peace Library – www.usip.org/library/topics/peacekeeping.html
- Center for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution – <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/chrcr/human.html>

Week 8. Perceptions and Misperceptions (DJ)

Lecture: The importance of intelligence and misperceptions in security. The rational choice model of international relations and the war puzzle. When and why does it go wrong? What are the consequences? Examples of intelligence failures in international crises, and misperceptions that altered lessons drawn from history.

Required Reading for Lecture

- Chapter 1: Johnson, D. D. P. 2004 *Overconfidence and War: The Havoc and Glory of Positive Illusions*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

Further reading

- McConnell, M (2007) Overhauling Intelligence, *Foreign Affairs*, July/August.
- Taylor, S. A. 2007 The Role of Intelligence in National Security. In *Contemporary Security Studies* (ed. A. Collins), pp. 248-269. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, D. D. P., & Tierney, D. R. (2011). The Rubicon theory of war: How the path to conflict reaches the point of no return. *International Security*, 36(1), 7-40.
- Johnson, DDP & Madin, E (2008) Paradigm shifts in security strategy: Why does it take disasters to trigger change? In: *Natural Security: A Darwinian Approach to a Dangerous World*, edited by R. Sagarin and T. Taylor: University of California Press.
- McDermott, R. (2004). *Political Psychology in International Relations*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mueller, J. 2005 Simplicity and spook: terrorism and the dynamics of threat exaggeration. *International Studies Perspectives* 6, 208-234.
- Rosen, S. P. (2004). *War and Human Nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sears, D. O., Huddy, L., & Jervis, R. (2003). *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tetlock, P. E. (1998). Social psychology and world politics. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 868-912). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Fallows, J. 2004 Blind into Baghdad. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 53-74.
- Allison, G. & Zelikow, P. 1999 *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: Longman.
- Walt, S. M. (2011). Wishful thinking: Top 10 examples of the most unrealistic expectations in contemporary U.S. foreign policy. *Foreign Policy*, April 29, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/2004/2029/wishful_thinking.

Week 9: Decision-Making and Domestic Politics in Security Policies (JK)

This week will extend the analysis of decision making and political psychology to look at the role of domestic political institutions and actors in security policies. It will address liberalism's expectations of the link between democratic institutions and peaceful policies and the role of public opinion, interest groups, government actors and political leaders in states' security policies.

Required Reading for Lecture

- John M. Owen (1994) 'How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace,' *International Security*, vol.19, no.2 (Fall): 87-125.

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

Further Reading

- Graham Allison (1969) 'Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis.' *American Political Science Review*, vol.63, no.3: 689-718.
- Daniel F. Baltrusaitis (2010) *Coalition Politics and the Iraq War: Determinants of Choice* (First Forum Press)
- Stephen G. Brooks (1997) "Dueling Realisms," *International Organization* 51(3) (Summer): 445-477.
- Chan, Steve and William S. Safran (2006) "Public Opinion as a Constraint Against War: Democracies' Responses to Operation Iraqi Freedom," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2:137-156.
- Davis, John (2006) "Infighting in Washington: The Impact of Bureaucratic Politics on US Iraq Policy," in *Presidential Policies and the Road to the Second War in Iraq*, edited by John Davis (Ashgate), pp.92-122
- Duffield, J. (1992) "International Regimes and Alliance Behavior: Explaining NATO Force Levels" *International Organization* 46: 819-855.
- Dyson, Stephen Benedict (2006) "Personality and Foreign Policy: Tony Blair's Iraq Decisions," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 3: 289-306
- Everts, Philip and Pierangelo Isernia, Eds. (2001) *Public Opinion and the International Use of Force* (Routledge). [Several country-specific chapters in this volume]
- Foyle, Douglas C., "Leading the Public to War? The Influence of American Public Opinion on the Bush Administration's Decision to Go to War in Iraq," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 16:269-294.
- Gourevitch, P. (2002) 'Domestic Politics and International Relations,' in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons, eds. *Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Sage Publications): 309-328.
- Hagan, J. (2001) "Does Decision Making Matter? Systemic Assumptions vs. Historical Reality in International Relations Theory." *International Studies Review* 3: 5-46
- Hermann, M., et al., (2001) "Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals", *International Studies Review*, 83-131
- Hollis, M. and Smith, S. (1986) "Roles and Reasons in Foreign Policy Decision Making". *British Journal of Political Science* 16: 269-
- Holsti, O. (2002) "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy Analysis," in M. Brecher and F. Harvey (Eds.) *Millennial Reflections on International Studies* (Michigan University Press), pp. 514-528.

- Hudson, V. (2005) "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations". *Foreign Policy Analysis* 1: 1-30.
- Juliet Kaarbo (1996) 'Power and Influence in Foreign Policy Decision Making: The Role of Junior Coalition Partners in German and Israeli Foreign Policy', *International Studies Quarterly*, December: 501-530.
- Juliet Kaarbo and Ryan Beasley, (2008) "Taking it to the Extreme: The Effect of Coalition Cabinets on Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2008, 4:67-81.
- Juliet Kaarbo and Jeffrey S. Lantis, (2003) "The 'Greening' of German Foreign Policy in the Iraq Case: Conditions of Junior Party Influence in Governing Coalitions," *Acta Politica*, September, 38: 201-230.
- Peter J. Katzenstein (Ed.) (1996) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* (Columbia University Press).
- Baris Kesgin and Juliet Kaarbo, (2010) "When and How Parliaments Influence Foreign Policy: The Case of Turkey's Iraq Decision," *International Studies Perspectives*, February, 11:19-36.
- Levy, J. S. (2003) "Political Psychology and Foreign Policy," in David Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (New York: Oxford University Press), pp. 253-284.
- Mearsheimer, John J. and Walt, Stephen M. "Is It Love or The Lobby? Explaining America's Special Relationship with Israel" *Security Studies* 18.1 (2009).
- Gil Merom (2003) *How Democracies Lose Small Wars* (Cambridge University Press)
- Rosati, J. A. (2000) "The Power of Human Cognition in the Study of World Politics," *International Studies Review*, 2:45-75
- Schafer, M. and Walker, S.G. (Eds.) (2006) *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code Analysis* (Palgrave: 2006).
- Schafer, M. and Crichlow, S. (2010) *Groupthink vs. High-Quality Decision Making in International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Randall L. Schweller (1994) "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In," *International Security*, Vol. 19(1) (Summer): 72-107.
- Sabastian Rosato (2003) 'The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,' *American Political Science Review* 97/4 (November): 595-602.
- Shannon, Vaughn P. and Jonathan W. Keller (2007) "Leadership Style and International Norm Violation: The Case of the Iraq War," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 3:79-104.
- Smith, S., Hadfield, A., and Dunne, T. (2007) *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases* (Oxford: OUP).
- Telhami, S. (2002) "Kenneth Waltz, Neorealism, and Foreign Policy," *Security Studies* 11:158-70

Week 10: Thinking Analytically About International Security (JK)

Lecture: Reflections on the concept of security and the role of the core international relations theories in understanding and practicing security strategies. How do defensive and offensive realism and constructivism explain past and present international politics? How do states and leaders differ in their worldviews? What are *their* theories of international relations?

Required Reading for Lecture

- Dannreuther, Roland (2007) *International Security: The Contemporary Agenda*, Chapter 11
- Jack Snyder, 'One World, Rival Theories', *Foreign Policy*, 145, 2004

Required Reading for Tutorial

See tutorial program (distributed separately by tutors)

- Brian C. Schmidt and Michael C. Williams (2008) 'The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives versus Realists' *Security Studies* 17(2).
- Shiping Tang (2009) 'The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis,' *Security Studies* 18(3).
- Marysia Zalewski (1996) 'All These Theories Yet the Bodies Keep Piling Up': Theory, Theorists, Theorising,' in S. Smith, K. Booth, and M. Zalewski (eds.), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press).

Further Readings

- David Baldwin, 'The Concept of Security', *Review of International Studies*, 23:1, 1997
- Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey (2006) 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies,' *Review of International Studies* 32: 329-352.
- Ken Booth and Nicholas J. Wheeler (2008) *The Security Dilemma: Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics* (Palgrave Macmillan).
- Benjamin Miller (2010) 'Explaining Changes in U.S. Grand Strategy: 9/11, the Rise of Offensive Liberalism, and the War in Iraq' *Security Studies* 19(1).
- Stephen Walt (1998) 'International Relations: One World, Many Theories', *Foreign Policy*, 110, 1998

Appendix A—Tutorial Assessment Criteria

Name:

Tutor:

	Criteria				Mark*
	Performance				
	Strong	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak		
Attendance / Promptness	Student is always prompt to tutorials.	Student is rarely late to tutorials.	Student is late to tutorials every second week .	Student is late to tutorials every week .	—
Level Of Engagement In Class	Student proactively contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions more than once per class.	Student proactively contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions once per class.	Student rarely contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions.	Student never contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions.	—
Listening Skills	Student listens when others talk, both in small and large group discussions. Student incorporates or builds off of the ideas of others.	Student listens when others talk, both in small and large group discussions.	Student does not listen when others talk, both in small and large group discussions.	Student does not listen when others talk, both in small and large group discussions Student often interrupts when others speak.	—
Preparation	Student is almost always prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading.	Student is usually prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading.	Student is rarely prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading.	Student is almost never prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading.	—
				Total---->	—

Tutor Comments

*A percentage mark will be awarded for each category, based on these general criteria, and then averaged out to give you your mark for the tutorial participation element (10% of your total mark).

Appendix B—Policy Brief Feedback Form

International Security
Policy Brief FEEDBACK FORM

Prepared by[]

Student's Examination No:

Policy Brief Number and Title:

Some factors informing assessment:	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E-H</i>
<i>Research</i>					
<i>Presentation</i>					
<i>Policy Analysis</i>					

Mark(s) deducted for late/ overlong policy brief _____

Comments:

Grade:

Appendix C—SSPS Common Essay Marking Descriptors

- A1** (90-100%) An answer that fulfils all of the criteria for ‘A2’ (see below) and in addition shows an exceptional degree of insight and independent thought, together with flair in tackling issues, yielding a product that is deemed to be of potentially publishable quality, in terms of scholarship and originality.
- A2** (80-89%) An authoritative answer that provides a fully effective response to the question. It should show a command of the literature and an ability to integrate that literature and go beyond it. The analysis should achieve a high level of quality early on and sustain it through to the conclusion. Sources should be used accurately and concisely to inform the answer but not dominate it. There should be a sense of a critical and committed argument, mindful of other interpretations but not afraid to question them. Presentation and the use of English should be commensurate with the quality of the content.
- A3** (70-79%) A sharply-focused answer of high intellectual quality, which adopts a comprehensive approach to the question and maintains a sophisticated level of analysis throughout. It should show a willingness to engage critically with the literature and move beyond it, using the sources creatively to arrive at its own independent conclusions.
- B** **B-** (60-63%) **B** (64-66%) **B+** (67-69%)
A very good answer that shows qualities beyond the merely routine or acceptable. The question and the sources should be addressed directly and fully. The work of other authors should be presented critically. Effective use should be made of the whole range of the literature. There should be no significant errors of fact or interpretation. The answer should proceed coherently to a convincing conclusion. The quality of the writing and presentation (especially referencing) should be without major blemish. Within this range a particularly strong answer will be graded **B+**; a more limited answer will be graded **B-**.
- C** **C-** (50-53%) **C** (54-56%) **C+** (57-59%)
A satisfactory answer with elements of the routine and predictable. It should be generally accurate and firmly based in the reading. It may draw upon a restricted range of sources but should not just re-state one particular source. Other authors should be presented accurately, if rather descriptively. The materials included should be relevant, and there should be evidence of basic understanding of the topic in question. Factual errors and misunderstandings of concepts and authors may occasionally be present but should not be a dominant impression. The quality of writing, referencing and presentation should be acceptable. Within this range a stronger answer will be graded **C+**; a weaker answer will be graded **C-**.
- D** **D-** (40-43%) **D** (44-46%) **D+** (47-49%)
A passable answer which understands the question, displays some academic learning and refers to relevant literature. The answer should be intelligible and in general factually accurate, but may well have deficiencies such as restricted use of sources or academic argument, over-reliance on lecture notes, poor expression, and irrelevancies to the question asked. The general impression may be of a rather poor effort, with weaknesses in conception or execution. It might also be the right mark for a short answer that at least referred to the main points of the issue. Within this range a stronger answer will be graded **D+**; a bare pass will be graded **D-**.
- E** (30-39%) An answer with evident weaknesses of understanding but conveying the sense that with a fuller argument or factual basis it might have achieved a pass. It might also be a short and fragmentary answer with merit in what is presented but containing serious gaps.
- F** (20-29%) An answer showing seriously inadequate knowledge of the subject, with little awareness of the relevant issues or literature, major omissions or inaccuracies, and pedestrian use of inadequate sources.
- G** (10-19%) An answer that falls far short of a passable level by some combination of short length, irrelevance, lack of intelligibility, factual inaccuracy and lack of acquaintance with reading or academic concepts.
- H** (0-9%) An answer without any academic merit which usually conveys little sense that the course has been followed or of the basic skills of essay-writing.

Appendix D—Coursework Submission Guidelines

These Guidelines come from standard practice guidelines for all Politics and International Relations courses

i) **Submission deadlines:** all essay deadlines should be set for 12 NOON. Please remind your students that the late penalty takes effect immediately after 12 NOON.

For **Politics Honours courses** which include an exam, the submission date for written coursework in Autumn semester needs to be no later than the end of week 8 (i.e. Friday 11 Nov 11). This is to allow students' work to be assessed and returned to them, with feedback, before the beginning of the exam period.

For courses assessed by coursework only, the submission date should be no later than Friday 9 December 11. Convenors of large courses may wish to set an earlier date as assessment of all first semester work must be completed and sent to the external examiner before the Christmas break.

ii) **Instructions for students:** As in previous years, all course work must be submitted as **hard copies AND electronically**.

Therefore, Honours course guides should include the following coursework submission instructions to students:

Submitting the hard copies

Students must deposit two hard copies of their essay in the Politics and IR Honours Essay Box, located in the wall outside room 1.11, Chrystal Macmillan Building. When doing so, students must complete a Politics IR Honours coversheet (available outside room 1.11), indicating their examination number and tutor's name, and signing a plagiarism form (see below).

Guidelines to Note

- Submit two copies of the essay.
- Put only your **Exam number** on each copy of the essay.
- Complete ONE Essay Front Coversheet and be sure you complete the **Plagiarism Statement** at the bottom of it.
- Staple the first copy of the essay to the front cover sheet and paperclip the second to both of them.
- Post the completed essays into the Politics essay box situated outside room 1.11, Chrystal Macmillan Building by **12pm** on the day of deadline.

NOTE: All students should pay particular attention when completing the Plagiarism segment of the Essay Front Coversheet. If it is not completed correctly, coursework **will not** be marked until the student returns to the office to complete/correct the section.

Electronic Submission

All honours courses now require that students submit their work electronically in addition to submitting two hard copies.

SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK TO WEBCT

- 1) In addition to the two hard copies, you must, by the same deadline, submit an electronic version via WebCT. The instructions for doing so are as follows.
- 2) Before submitting your coursework, please ensure that you **SAVE YOUR ESSAY WITH A FILE NAME THAT INCLUDES YOUR EXAM NUMBER**. To ensure anonymity, do not include your name anywhere on the essay.
- 3) Do not submit your bibliography separately from the essay. Our internal checks make sure the bibliography will not count as 'plagiarised' material.
- 4) Failure to follow these instructions will cause delays in getting your work marked and returned to you.

FILE FORMAT

- 1) Files must be in Word (.doc), rich text (.rtf), text (.txt) or PDF format. Microsoft Publisher, Open Office and Microsoft Works files will not be accepted.

UPLOADING AND SUBMITTING YOUR ESSAY

- 1) At the Course Home Page click on the Assignments tab situated on the Course Tools bar at the left hand side of the page.
- 2) Click on the relevant essay title in the middle of the screen (It will be called 'Course essay' or such) and then either:
- 3) Click on Add Attachment and locate your essay on your computer and attach it. Or you can copy and paste your essay into the window provided.
- 4) Click on Submit to finish.

iii) **Penalties for late submission** must be clearly stated in your course handbooks. The penalties are set by College, and are as follows:

- Five marks per working day (i.e. excluding weekends) for up to 5 days;
- Coursework handed in more than 5 days late will receive a **zero**
- If you intend to penalise over-long essays (your call), please make that clear in your course guide. (e.g. 'essays more than 10% over the word limit will lose xx marks')
- **PLEASE NOTE that failure to submit an electronic version along with the hard copy of your coursework will be treated as failure to submit, and subject to the same lateness penalties set out above.**

RULES ON LATE SUBMISSION

The School has set guidelines and processes for students claiming a legitimate reason for late submission of assessed work. These rules, which are set out below, also appear in the Politics and International Relations Honours Handbooks. There is no need to reproduce them in your course guides, but please make reference to them and refer students to the Handbook. Please also be aware of the implications for staff. Following completion by students of the lateness penalty waiver, **course convenors are free to partially waive a penalty if they feel that to be the most appropriate course of action. For example, if a student has a legitimate reason for late submission, but not one that merits the degree of lateness, convenors may decide that a partial waiver is appropriate. If**

anyone wishes to exercise this freedom, please make sure that the final mark is clear, and the partial waiver justified, on the marksheet.

Extract from Honours handbooks:

LATE SUBMISSION OF ASSESSED COURSEWORK:

Managing deadlines is a basic life skill and you are expected to have mastered this skill by the time you reach Honours. Timely submission of all assessed items (coursework, essays, dissertations, etc.) is a vitally important responsibility at Honours level. Unexcused lateness can put at risk your prospects of proceeding to Senior Honours, and can damage your final degree grade.

Work submitted late is subject to a 'lateness penalty' of 5 marks deducted per working day after the deadline, and will receive a mark of '0' (without being marked) if submitted after five working days.

Please note: Failure to submit an electronic version along with the hard copy of your coursework will be treated as failure to submit, and subject to the same lateness penalties set out above.

If there are factors beyond your control which make it essential for you to submit work after the deadline you must fill in a **'Lateness Penalty Waiver'** (LPW) form, copies of which can be found outside room 1.11, CMB, stating the reason for the request. You should submit requests as soon as possible, preferably before the deadline in question. But you should always submit an LPW form when work is late, even if you are unable to submit the form until after the missed deadline.

In cases where there is clear evidence and/or appropriate documentation, and the lateness is under 5 working days, the form can be submitted directly to the Honours secretary (Susan Orr) in room 1.11, who will sign the form to acknowledge receipt and forward it to your DoS and the course convenor.

Please **DO NOT** ask the Honours secretary about whether your request is likely to be approved, and **DO NOT** apply for a penalty waiver on non-legitimate grounds such as having a heavy workload or computer problems. Your Honours secretary may decide your request does not meet the criteria above, refuse to receive the form, and refer you to your DoS.

All other cases should be referred directly to your **Director of Studies**. Specifically, if there is any possibility that you may be more than five working days late in submitting, or if the reasons for your lateness are not clearly supported by documentation, you must discuss the problem and the timing of submission with your Director of Studies. You should bring a copy of the LPW form with you when you go to discuss the matter with your DoS. If your DoS supports your request, they should sign the form and forward it to the course convenor.

Please note: Course convenors should **not** be approached directly with requests for an extension. The formal process outlined above of requesting a Late Penalty Waiver must **always** be followed.

Please also note: Signing the LPW form by either the honours secretary or your DoS only indicates acknowledgment of the request, not the waiving of lateness penalties.

A provisional decision may be made by the Course Convenor, but final decisions on all marks rest with the International Relations exam board. However, you can be reasonably confident that if your request provides good reasons, is well documented and/or supported by your DoS, and the degree of lateness is proportionate to the reasons for the delay, then lateness penalties will be lifted. At their discretion, course convenors may partially waive lateness penalties if they feel the reason for late submission is legitimate, unless they believe that the length of the delay in submitting the work is disproportionate to the reasons for the late submission.