

POL486H1: Grand Strategy—International and Domestic Sources of National Security Policy

University of Toronto, Department of Political Science
Fall 2018, Thursdays 12-2p (Classes begin on Sept 13th and end on Dec 6th)
Room: SS 1078

Professor Jon R. Lindsay (jon.lindsay@utoronto.ca)
Office hours: Thursdays 3-5:30p, Room 219, 315 Bloor W (The Observatory); sign up at https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1bpvaguG4gMi_hjigO71igxLKYQMZ0pOt5ISj9vGpopw/edit?usp=sharing (Changes to office hours will be noted at this link).

Contents

Description	2
Materials	2
Format.....	3
Requirements.....	5
Schedule.....	7
13 Sep: Introduction	7
20 Sep: Military Power in the 21 st Century	7
27 Sep: No Class	9
4 Oct: System Level Theory.....	9
11 Oct: Unit Level Theory	10
18 Oct: United States	12
25 Oct: China.....	14
1 Nov: Japan.....	18
8 Nov: No Class	19
15 Nov: Israel	19
22 Nov: Pakistan	20
29 Nov: Russia.....	21
6 Dec: Scenario Workshop.....	23
Appendix	23
North Korea.....	23
South Korea.....	25

Canada	25
Islamic State (Daesh).....	26
India	27

Description

Grand strategy is national policy for integrating all instruments of power—diplomatic, informational, military, and economic—to advance national security interests. Even small states and non-state actors have grand strategies, and states have them even if they don’t write about them, and perhaps even if their own policymakers don’t understand them very well. New technologies, economic globalization, and changes in the political fortunes of states have created a complex and uncertain threat environment in the 21st century. The proliferation of nuclear weapons to new actors, the development of autonomous weapons, ubiquitous dependence on cyberspace and satellites, and global terrorism pose major challenges for the formulation of national security policy. This doesn’t mean that traditional great power politics have receded, however; in some ways they are more important than ever.

This is a project-based course designed to give you tools to jump into the analysis of a state or region with which you are unfamiliar. The course begins with a survey of the factors that influence grand strategy in theory, such as technological innovation, the balance of power, domestic institutions, and complex interactions across these factors. Rough but time-tested concepts are used to flag potentially relevant dynamics and triangulate more detailed questions. Student teams then systematically explore competing structural (systemic) and institutional (unit) explanations for grand strategy and defense policy in a series of regional case studies. Students will compare and contrast the national security policies of a selection of countries that have interestingly different geopolitical characteristics. This course will not make you an expert on the strategy or policy of any particular state, but it will teach you something about the comparative method of analysis and the determinants of national security policy.

The regional focus will vary with each iteration of this seminar. For 2018 we will delve into the Northeast Asia region with a focus on the six parties to the slow burning nuclear crisis with North Korean (i.e., the US, China, DPRK, ROK, Japan, and Russia). The final course will enable students to work through a response to a nuclear crisis scenario on the Korean Peninsula.

Materials

Required articles will usually be posted on the portal. Articles should also be reachable on JSTOR through a U of T internet connection. There are two required books. And, yes, one is a novel.

- Singer, P. W., and August Cole. *Ghost Fleet: A Novel of the Next World War*. Mariner Books, 2016.
- Posen, Barry R. *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2014.

In previous iterations I have assigned another book by Posen, *Sources of Military Doctrine*. We will read just one chapter this year. I highly recommend that you read the entire text for examples of how to compare system and unit level explanations for strategic choices.

- Posen, Barry. *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany between the World Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.

The following sources are useful for assessing the balance of power for your projects:

- *The Military Balance* from the International Institute for Strategic Studies provides detailed profiles on country force structure, doctrine, and employment published yearly. Available online through UoT library.
- State military expenditures and arms transfers: <http://www.sipri.org/databases>
- World Development Indicators from the World Bank (useful for charting relative growth and other correlates of power & wealth) can be readily visualized through Google: <https://www.google.com/publicdata/explore?ds=d5bncppjof8f9>.

Format

This course is capped at twenty students to ensure that group sizes and discussions are manageable. Preference will be given to graduate students and upper division undergraduates in the Political Science Department. Prior introduction to international relations theory is a prerequisite for this course. Students are expected to be familiar with concepts such as anarchy, the balance of power, and the security dilemma, as well as institutionalist and constructivist alternatives to realist theory. We will do some work to summarize theoretical approaches and expose students to a portfolio of theoretical tools in the course, but the emphasis in this course is the application of theory to contemporary cases.

The heart of this course is the analysis of different national strategies after an introduction to analytical concepts. I will cover the United States as an example (which is also important to understand as an input to the grand strategy of other states) during the theory weeks. We will hold a “draft” on Week 3 to assign students to the countries examined after the break. You’ll get to focus on system or structural (3rd image) explanation for one country, and then unit or institutional (2nd image) factors for another. We are aiming for 3-4 students per group.

The first part of the seminar is dedicated to discussion of theoretical approaches to strategy and policy. If you have never been exposed to international relations theory in an academic course, you may want to reconsider whether you want to take this class, as the focus will be on applying and debating theory in real cases. I will provide a “gouge sheet” listing different explanatory variables typically employed in system level and unit level explanations, linked to important dimensions of defense policy (our dependent variables). This list is not exhaustive by any means, and it will make little sense without the accompanying readings, but it provides a mnemonic. Specifically, we will look at the factors which shape diplomatic alliances, military doctrine, civil-military integration, and defense innovation. Use this as a guide to structuring your presentation and paper, but as a group you will have to make decisions about what to emphasize and how to combine mechanisms where multiple ones apply.

In the second, empirical portion of the course, each case study session will be structured as a debate between groups arguing, respectively, for the importance of systemic/international or unit/domestic factors. Each group will prepare in advance a **40 min (max!! Aim for 30 min)** presentation on factors driving strategy and policy for the country of interest. Please keep slides to a minimum—a map showing the region or some relevant charts and graphs depicting the military balance and economic growth trends

would be appropriate for system groups, while unit groups might want to highlight demographic trends, domestic political competition, and the relevant bureaucratic ecology. We will follow with a 30m discussion/debate about the two perspectives. I expect the students who did not present to actively question the complex relationships between the two levels of analysis. Participation marks encompass the whole seminar, not just the first five weeks.

Each of these presentations should address the strategies and policies of the state in question (i.e., the dependent variables you are trying to explain), and the systemic or unit factors that you assess cause them to take the value they do (i.e., the independent and conditioning variables that provide an explanation). Each group should explain how some combination of relevant factors affect national choices and debates about diplomatic alignment and reliance on international security institutions, military doctrine and posture including the role of nuclear weapons, civil-military relations and domestic politics, and the innovativeness of military doctrine and the defense industry. You will have to make choices about what to emphasize. Your goal is to make a clear argument, not to provide an encyclopedic listing of facts. It is likely that groups will have different opinions about the most important causes and effects—there is rarely one right answer about something as controversial as the use of force. Exploring these differences in interpretation is an important part of the exercise.

Paper format. Please turn in your paper as a PDF document. Please use double-spaced 12-point font. Use Chicago style short cites—“Posen, *Restraint*, p. 1”—for anything on the syllabus. Use Chicago style full citations for the first cite of any other material and short citations for subsequent mentions. This means you do *not* need to include a bibliography. Please use footnotes rather than endnotes. Your footnotes *will* be counted as part of the word count. Note that the word limit is a word limit, and I (or the TA if there is one) may elect to stop reading beyond it. All papers must have a clear introduction that summarizes the argument; it is best to draft this when you start and then rewrite it when you finish your paper, since sometimes you figure out a new article while writing. Try to summarize your argument with an arrow diagram—if you cannot it is likely too complex or murky. Likewise, all sections must have clear opening and concluding paragraphs, and all paragraphs must have clear opening and concluding sentence.

Deadlines. Turn in your papers via the course portal for the given assignment. Late assignments will be downgraded 5% (about a half grade) per day after the deadline. Extensions may be granted if sought *in advance* with a valid and documented excuse.

Attendance. Unless there is a valid emergency, students must attend all seminar sessions on time and be prepared and ready to participate. Class sessions are all scheduled in advance, and you should be able to build your extracurricular activities around them. If I call on you and you are not in class it will be awkward for us all. Try to eat something before class so that your mind has nourishment other than the fascinating conversations we will have together.

Preparation. Deliberate and active engagement with the reading will prime you for a good discussion in class. Think about how the readings for one week relate to the previous weeks’ concepts, and how the ideas in them might relate to contemporary defense problems. Lectures and discussions will not simply recapitulate the material in the reading.

Please put down the glowing rectangle. It takes work for all of us to battle the enemies of knowledge. Thinking is hard work. Don’t let the internet make it harder. Flashing pixels distract your concentration

by making feckless appeals to your primate reflexes. Studies have shown that your retention and participation are better if you take notes by hand instead of typing. If you think you are good at multitasking, think again; science says you are fooling yourself and wasting time. Worse, you are undermining your classmates' learning experience with the digital equivalent of second-hand smoke.

Stand on the shoulders of giants. Your work must be original but should draw on ideas from the readings and lecture. Quotations and paraphrasing of other authors must be cited. Wikipedia is not a source. And in your research zeal, remember...

Remain in the light. Plagiarism will be severely punished according to university guidelines. It will be much harder to learn after you have been cast into outer darkness. Plagiarism is not only illegal, but it is also just a dumb idea, even, or especially, when prominent politicians do it.

Requirements

Individual Participation (20%). This is an advanced seminar, which means that discussion and debate will be guided by questions and interests that emerge through our conversation. What you get out of it depends on what you put into it. I look for evidence of your active engagement with the reading in your comments and questions in seminar discussion or in my office hours. I may ask students to summarize the argument of one of the readings in class, provide an example of where it applies, or provide a counterargument, so please prepare accordingly. Readings and seminars, much like cyber operations and military force, are complements not substitutes. You are expected to do the required reading for a country even if you are not presenting. If you are presenting you may want to delve into some of the recommended reading. You are, of course, encouraged to go elsewhere too.

Your participation grade includes your participation in sessions where you are not in a presenting group. You will be expected to do the required reading and ask questions. The participation grade also covers your involvement in the final scenario workshop.

Military Power Paper (20%). Prepare a short paper (2000 words max, about 10pp) on the system and unit level sources of national military power. This paper is due Sunday 21 October at midnight. Paper marks will be returned no later than 5 November.

What explains why states have the military force structure and posture that they do? Your goal is to put the two weeks on system and unit level theory into conversation with the week on military power. This will help you to consolidate concepts and get ready to apply them in the group projects. Your paper should have three parts. First, review the literature assigned for the "system level theory" week, highlighting key themes and arguments that cut across the different readings. Second, do the same for the readings assigned for the "unit level theory" week. Third, explain which you find more persuasive; or, explain why it is important to look at the interaction of system and unit level factors, highlighting conditions under which you expect one or the other to have more explanatory power. Your paper should have a clear introduction summarizing your argument.

Group Projects. See the format section above for detailed instructions.

- **System-Level Analysis—Presentation (15%) and Paper (10%)**
- **Unit-Level Analysis—Presentation (15%) and Paper (10%)**

All group members receive the same mark. Each group will prepare one paper (3000 words max with footnotes and Chicago style citations) due one week (midnight Thursday) after your presentation—please email a PDF to me. Your paper should first present a coherent stand-alone summary of the argument you presented in class. Second, please respond to the arguments presented by your counterpart group. Third, comment on which perspective you believe has more explanatory power for your country. While your presentation will take a strong side on the system-unit debate, the paper should aim to produce an honest appraisal. I want to see in the paper what your group believes actually explains why your country has the defense policy that it does. So, for instance, if you are in the 3rd image group but you end up finding the 2nd image arguments more persuasive, then say so and explain why.

Individual Reflection Paper (10%). The final paper (1000 words **max**) is due Thursday, 6 December, by midnight. This is your chance to reflect on grand strategy in the 21st century based on our discussions throughout the term. I welcome papers that take a step back and compare different states, which can include those we have visited in the course, or others. You might discuss implications for Canadian grand strategy and/or defense policy, some other country that we haven't covered, a coherent collection of countries like NATO, or a quasi-state like Hezbollah. If you would like to focus in depth on some more specific defense policy issue for Canada or some other country, like procurement or cybersecurity, that is fine too, but be sure to articulate the ends-means chain back to grand strategy.

You can structure this paper however you would like, but here are some questions to get you thinking:

- In general: How would you define grand strategy? Which factors seem most important to you in determining what countries choose—or should choose? Do you suspect there are important factors that have been left out of our analysis this term, and if so what is an example of them making an important difference? Is the 21st century just too different or complex for this—or any—framework to be of use for thinking about security?
- For Canada (or some other country X): what do all the above questions mean for Canada? How do you see Canada's threat environment changing in the future? What are Canada's vital vs. discretionary interests, and how would you prioritize addressing them? Under what conditions should Canada go to war? What are the most likely, least likely, and most dangerous conflict scenarios for Canada in the next few years? Is Canada ready and able to address these concerns? What are Canada's institutional advantages and challenges in implementing a grand strategy? Is Canadian defense policy on the right track or are major reforms appropriate? What is the prognosis for the reforms you envision in the current political environment?
- How do the grand strategies of different Northeast Asian states affect the prospects of deterrence, counter-proliferation, and crisis management on the Korean Peninsula? Are there contradictions between the dictates of strategy (how to prevail in a conflict) and grand strategy (when to get involved in conflict) in this instance? How might they be resolved? What should Canada's role be given the new realities of DPRK nuclearization?
- Remember, every state has threats, politics, and individuals, but we would like to know which are most influential in driving outcomes because these are the factors that we can hope to affect in crafting pragmatic engagement (or confrontation) policies. In a counterfactual world with different leaders, parties in power, or threats in the neighborhood, what kind of behavior would you expect from your country? If you believe that a complex interaction of factors is most important, try to say more than that the world is complex and everything matters.

Schedule

13 Sep: What is Grand Strategy?

Welcome. In this session we'll do introductions, and preview the course. We'll also talk about what makes grand strategy so grand.

- Read the syllabus. If you've come this far, you're off to a good start.
- Silove, Nina. "Beyond the Buzzword: The Three Meanings of 'Grand Strategy.'" *Security Studies* advance online (August 28, 2017): 1–31.

Recommended

- Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," *World Politics* vol. 51, no. 1 (1998): 144-172
- Narizny, Kevin. "On Systemic Paradigms and Domestic Politics: A Critique of the Newest Realism." *International Security* 42, no. 2 (November 1, 2017): 155–90.
- Ole R. Holsti, "Models of International Relations and Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* vol. 13, no. 1 (1989): 15-44
- Hew Strachan, "The meaning of strategy: historical perspectives," in *The Direction of War: Contemporary Strategy in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge UP, 2013): 26-45
- Arend Lijphart, "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review* vol. 65, no. 3 (1971): 682-693

20 Sep: Military Power in the 21st Century

This week we will be discussing the instruments of military power, which is a key independent and/or dependent variable for almost any analysis of grand strategy and defense policy. Modern military power is incredibly complex with forces operating on land, at sea, in the air and space, and increasingly in cyberspace. To get a sense of how different types of forces work and how they interact in the US case, and to understand part of the premise of the Singer & Cole novel, please read:

- Posen, *Restraint*, part 3, "Command of the Commons," pp. 135-163
 - This is an updated version of an important article in security studies: Posen, Barry R. "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony." *International Security* 28, no. 1 (2003): 5–46.
 - How does the US military project power in the sea, air, and space domains?
 - Why is the land domain different?
 - What is the role of cyberspace in this scheme, which Posen doesn't mention?
 - What are the grand strategic implications of this perspective for the US, according to Posen?
 - How might Posen's critics draw different implications from his same considerations about US military power position?

Next you have a choice. Option 1 is a novel grounded in real technological possibilities (endnotes!) that imagines the end of US command of the commons. Read to get a flavor of military operations, not for the (silly) plot, by answering the questions below. Option 2, if you really, really object to reading fiction,

is to read at least one selection from the list below for each warfighting domain (land, sea, air, space, cyber) and nuclear weapons (i.e., six readings). Try to answer the same questions listed for Option 1.

Option 1—Speculative Fiction

We cannot predict the future, but we can imagine it. How might new weapons and emerging political trends interact to create the future security environment? This novel speculates about a potential war between the United States and China, and it has many endnotes about the real-world inspirations for its many gadgets. Try to read for an understanding of the weapons and tactics of modern war, but do not worry about the plot or characters, which are problematic to say the least. As you read, please try to answer the questions.

- Singer, P. W., and August Cole. *Ghost Fleet: A Novel of the Next World War*. Mariner Books, 2016.
 - What political, strategic, and operational assumptions in the story seem plausible or unrealistic to you?
 - Try to identify different distinguishing characteristics of war in different domains, i.e., land, sea, air, space, and cyberspace.
 - How does automation affect political strategy and military operations, and what is the difference between them?
 - Do technologies have particular strengths, weaknesses, or political-military consequences at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels of war?
 - How do organizational factors like doctrine and human skill condition or interact with technological capability?
 - Can you imagine conflict scenarios that are different from what Singer and Cole imagine using the same technologies? What different assumptions about time, space, wealth, and complexity might we make?
 - Where are the nuclear weapons in this story, and how might things change if they were included?

Option 2—Scholarship

- LAND POWER: Biddle, Stephen. "Rebuilding the Foundations of Offense-Defense Theory." *The Journal of Politics* 63, no. 3 (2001): 741–74.
 - Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976. Books 1, 2, 8.
 - U. S. Army. *FM 3-24: Counterinsurgency*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2006. Ch. 1
- SEA POWER: Montgomery, Evan Braden. "Contested Primacy in the Western Pacific: China's Rise and the Future of U.S. Power Projection." *International Security* 38, no. 4 (2014): 115–49.
 - Corbett, Julian Stafford. *Some Principles of Maritime Strategy*. London, 1911.
<http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/15076>. In Part I, Ch 1,3,4
 - Brodie, Bernard. *A Guide to Naval Strategy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1944. "Command of the sea"

- AIR POWER: Byman, Daniel L., and Matthew C. Waxman. “Kosovo and the Great Air Power Debate.” *International Security* 24, no. 4 (2000): 5–38.
 - Maclsaac, David. “Voices from the Central Blue: The Air Power Theorists.” In *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, edited by Peter Paret, Gordon Alexander Craig, and Felix Gilbert, 624–47. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- SPACE POWER: Carter, Ashton B. “Satellites and Anti-Satellites: The Limits of the Possible.” *International Security* 10, no. 4 (1986): 46–98.
 - Morgan, Forrest E. “Deterrence and First-Strike Stability in Space.” Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2010. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG916.html>
- NUCLEAR WEAPONS: Vipin Narang. “What Does It Take to Deter? Regional Power Nuclear Postures and International Conflict.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57, no. 3 (June 1, 2013): 478–508.
 - Narang, Vipin. “Strategies of Nuclear Proliferation: How States Pursue the Bomb.” *International Security* 41, no. 3 (January 1, 2017): 110–50.
 - Lieber, Keir A., and Daryl G. Press. “The New Era of Counterforce: Technological Change and the Future of Nuclear Deterrence.” *International Security* 41, no. 4 (April 1, 2017): 9–49.
- CYBER POWER: Lindsay, Jon R. “Restrained by Design: The Political Economy of Cybersecurity.” *Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance* 19, no. 6 (2017): 493–514.

27 Sep: No Class Meeting—Reading Session

There is no class or office hours meeting this week. There is a lot of reading for the next two sessions. Use this week to get ahead and get started on your first paper.

4 Oct: System Level Theory

This week focuses on analytical concepts for the assessment of grand strategy at the systemic level (3rd image).

- Robert S. Ross, “The Geography of the Peace: East Asia in the Twenty-First Century,” *International Security* 23, no. 4 (1999): 81–118.
 - Every system-level analysis must begin with a map!
 - Recommended: Spykman, Nicholas J. “Geography and Foreign Policy, I.” *The American Political Science Review* 32, no. 1 (1938): 28–50; Spykman, Nicholas J. “Geography and Foreign Policy, II.” *The American Political Science Review* 32, no. 2 (1938): 213–36; Mackinder, Halford J. *Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Study in the Politics of Reconstruction*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1996.
- Posen, Barry. *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany between the World Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984, ch 2, “Explaining Military Doctrine”
 - This chapter presents both system and unit (organizational) explanations for military doctrine. We will discuss the system perspective this week and the organizational perspective next week.
 - Ch 1 is recommended for an overview of the military dimension of grand strategy. Ch 2 presents hypotheses on its variation.

- The remaining (empirical) chapters in this book provide excellent examples of how to compare system and unit level explanations for strategic choices. Highly recommended.
- Robert Jervis, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* vol. 30, no. 2 (1978): 167-214
 - This classic article should be familiar. If you have never read it, read it closely. If you have read it, skim to refresh yourself on the argument.
 - Optional (i.e., look at the figures): Shiping Tang, "The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis," *Security Studies* 18, no. 3 (2009): 587–623.
 - Jervis' notion of offense-defense distinguishability is both useful and problematic. Think about what it means in the world of *Ghost Fleet*. Optional: Sean M. Lynn-Jones, "Offense-Defense Theory and Its Critics," *Security Studies* vol. 4, no. 4 (1995): 660-691
- Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity," *International Organization* vol. 44, no. 2 (1990): 137-168.
 - Focus on pp. 137-40, 147-150.
 - Skim the argument and look at the tables: Snyder, Glenn H. "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics." *World Politics* 36, no. 4 (1984): 461–95.
 - Optional: Stephen M. Walt, "Alliances in a Unipolar World," *World Politics* 61, no. 1 (2009): 86–120.
- Vipin Narang. "What Does It Take to Deter? Regional Power Nuclear Postures and International Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57, no. 3 (June 1, 2013): 478–508.
 - Nuclear weapons pose an existential threat. Grand strategy in the 21st century always has a nuclear component: how do nuclear states use their weapons, and why do non-nuclear states seek or eschew nuclear weapons?
 - Monteiro, Nuno P., and Alexandre Debs. "The Strategic Logic of Nuclear Proliferation." *International Security* 39, no. 2 (October 1, 2014): 7–51.
 - Narang, Vipin. "Strategies of Nuclear Proliferation: How States Pursue the Bomb." *International Security* 41, no. 3 (January 1, 2017): 110–50.

Recommended

- R. Harrison Wagner, "What Was Bipolarity?" *International Organization* vol. 47, no. 1 (1993): 77-106
- Charles L. Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," *International Security* 19, no. 3 (1994): 50–90.
- Paul M. Kennedy, ed., *Grand Strategies in War and Peace* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991)
- John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003)

11 Oct: Unit Level Theory

This week focuses on analytical concepts for assessment of grand strategy at the unit level (2rd image). There are a lot of readings this week. Start early. Try to pull out the basic arguments.

- Posen, Barry. *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany between the World Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984, ch 2, “Explaining Military Doctrine”
 - You read this last week (right?)—refresh on the table of organizational explanations.
- Jack Snyder, *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition* (Cornell, 1993), chapter 2
 - Optional, but highly recommended, on authoritarian civil-military relations: Risa Brooks. “Civil-Military Relations in the Middle East.” In *The Future Security Environment in the Middle East: Conflict, Stability, and Political Change*, edited by Nora Bensahel and Daniel L. Byman, 129–62. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2005.
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2005/MR1640.pdf.
- Etel Solingen, “Pax Asiatica Versus Bella Levantina: The Foundations of War and Peace in East Asia and the Middle East,” *American Political Science Review* vol. 101, no. 4 (2007): 757-780
 - How do political economy strategies affect security policies? Try to get a sense of her argument by studying the diagrams, then skim the text.
- Eric Heginbotham, “The Fall and Rise of Navies in East Asia: Military Organizations, Domestic Politics, and Grand Strategy,” *International Security* 27, no. 2 (2002): 86–125.
- Evera, Stephen van. “Hypotheses on Nationalism and War.” *International Security* 18, no. 4 (1994): 5–39.
 - Look at the table of hypotheses, then skim if you would like more discussion & context.
- Hudson, Valerie M., and Andrea Den Boer. “A Surplus of Men, A Deficit of Peace: Security and Sex Ratios in Asia’s Largest States.” *International Security* 26, no. 4 (April 1, 2002): 5–38.
 - Skim for the basic argument. This is one way in which gendered factors may have grand strategic implications. There may be others, including...
 - McDermott, Rose. “Sex and Death: Gender Differences in Aggression and Motivations for Violence.” *International Organization* 69, no. 3 (July 2015): 753–75.
- Saunders, Elizabeth N. “No Substitute for Experience: Presidents, Advisers, and Information in Group Decision Making.” *International Organization* 71, no. S1 (April 2017): S219–47.
 - This question took on a new urgency on January 20th, 2017.
 - Alternative: Daniel Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack, “Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In,” *International Security* vol. 25, no. 4 (2001): 107-146
 - Alternative: Jervis, Robert. “Do Leaders Matter and How Would We Know?” *Security Studies* 22, no. 2 (April 1, 2013): 153–79.
 - An important twist on the rationality debate: Rathbun, Brian. “The Rarity of Realpolitik: What Bismarck’s Rationality Reveals about International Politics.” *International Security* 43, no. 1 (August 1, 2018): 7–55.

Highly recommended—you are not required to read these but they are both seminal articles that you will find helpful for thinking across levels of analysis.

- Robert D. Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games,” *International Organization* vol. 42, no. 3 (1988): 427-460

- Graham T. Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *American Political Science Review* vol. 63, no. 3 (1969): 689-718

Recommended

- James D. Fearon, "Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations," *Annual Review of Political Science* vol. 1 (1998): 289-313
- G. John Ikenberry, "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order," *International Security* vol. 23, no. 3 (1999): 43-78
- Risa Brooks. "Civil-Military Relations in the Middle East." In *The Future Security Environment in the Middle East: Conflict, Stability, and Political Change*, edited by Nora Bensahel and Daniel L. Byman, 129–62. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2005.
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2005/MR1640.pdf
- Deborah D. Avant, "The Institutional Sources of Military Doctrine: Hegemons in Peripheral Wars," *International Studies Quarterly* vol. 37, no. 4 (1993): 409-430
- Gartzke, Erik. "Democracy and the Preparation for War: Does Regime Type Affect States' Anticipation of Casualties?" *International Studies Quarterly* 45, no. 3 (September 1, 2001): 467–84.
- Edward N. Luttwak, "From Vietnam to Desert Fox: Civil-Military Relations in Modern Democracies," *Survival* vol. 41, no. 1 (1999): 99 – 112
- Haas, Mark L. "Ideological Polarity and Balancing in Great Power Politics." *Security Studies* 23, no. 4 (2014): 715–53.

18 Oct: United States

Note that your military power paper is due at the end of this week. This week is the transition between the theory and case portion of the class. I will give you an example of how to apply the theoretical tools in the case of the USA. We will discuss the U.S. as an example of how to put these theories to work. The U.S. also looms large as the unipole or liberal hegemon for all other cases. There is an active debate about U.S. grand strategy at the system level, with different assumptions about threats, and about the effects of unit level factors.

- Posen, *Restraint*, pp. 1-134
 - Posen presents two different visions of US grand strategy. What are they?
 - Be sure to distinguish between explanatory (what strategy does the US have and why) and normative (what strategy should the US have and why) arguments. Where and why is there a gap between is and ought according to Posen?
 - What is the role of system and unit level factors in each strategy? What unit level factors influence elements of restraint or hegemony? What system level factors are in play (or should be)?
 - Can you devise an argument *for* rather than *against* liberal hegemony? Does your argument rely on system or unit level justifications?
 - Where do you think the Trump administration (or parts of it) fall along this spectrum? More generally, how consistent or divergent is Trump with traditional US policy

positions, and what might be the long term consequence of any divergence? Base your answers on theories of grand strategy and defense policy we have reviewed.

Recommended

- Additional arguments about restraint
 - Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* vol. 21, no. 3 (1997): 5-53. Study the table at the beginning comparing assumptions for four rather than just two different grand strategies. The discussion section is now a bit dated, but the range of variation is still relevant.
 - Posen, Barry R. "Pull Back." *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2013. This is the reader's digest version of *Restraint*.
 - For Posen's classic argument about the military justification for restraint, see: Barry R. Posen, "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony," *International Security* vol. 28, no. 1 (2003): 5-46.
 - Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. "The Case for Offshore Balancing." *Foreign Affairs*, June 19, 2016. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/usa/2016-06-13/case-offshore-balancing>. Mearsheimer and Walt are reacting to: Brands, Hal. "The Limits of Offshore Balancing." Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, September 24, 2015. <https://ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1291>.
 - Porter, Patrick. "Why America's Grand Strategy Has Not Changed: Power, Habit, and the U.S. Foreign Policy Establishment." *International Security* 42, no. 04 (May 1, 2018): 9–46. Beware the Blob.
- Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, "Don't Come Home, America: The Case against Retrenchment," *International Security* 37, no. 3 (2012): 7–51.
 - One alternative to Posen's view. The title is a reference to a neoisolationist argument from the 1990s by Posen's colleagues at MIT: Eugene Gholz, Daryl G. Press and Harvey M. Sapolsky, "Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation," *International Security* vol. 21, no. 4 (1997): 5-48
 - The book-length argument: Brooks, Stephen G., and William C. Wohlforth. *America Abroad: The United States' Global Role in the 21st Century*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Gavin, Francis J. "Strategies of Inhibition: U.S. Grand Strategy, the Nuclear Revolution, and Nonproliferation." *International Security* 40, no. 1 (2015): 9–46.
- Cha, Victor D. "Powerplay: Origins of the U.S. Alliance System in Asia." *International Security* 34, no. 3 (2009): 158–96.
 - Book version: Cha, Victor. *Powerplay: The Origins of the American Alliance System in Asia*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- Dombrowski, Peter J., and Simon Reich. "Does Donald Trump Have a Grand Strategy?" *International Affairs* 93, no. 5 (n.d.): 1013–37.
 - Kahl, Colin, and Hal Brands. "Trump's Grand Strategic Train Wreck." *Foreign Policy*, January 31, 2017. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/31/trumps-grand-strategic-train-wreck/>

- Reich and Dombrowski have a whole book on US grand strategy (or the lack thereof) with a maritime flair: Reich, Simon, and Peter Dombrowski. *The End of Grand Strategy: US Maritime Operations in the Twenty-First Century*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2018.
- Clarke, Michael, and Anthony Ricketts. “Did Obama Have a Grand Strategy?” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 40, no. 1–2 (January 2, 2017): 295–324.
- Drezner, Daniel W. “Values, Interests, and American Grand Strategy.” *Diplomatic History* 29, no. 3 (June 1, 2005): 429–32.
- Art, Robert J. “Geopolitics Updated: The Strategy of Selective Engagement.” *International Security* 23, no. 3 (1998): 79–113.
- Michael Mastanduno, “System Maker and Privilege Taker: U.S. Power and the International Political Economy,” *World Politics* 61, no. 1 (2009): 121–154.
 - This is a follow on to Mastanduno, Michael. “Preserving the Unipolar Moment: Realist Theories and U.S. Grand Strategy after the Cold War.” *International Security* 21, no. 4 (April 1, 1997): 49–88.
- John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security* (Oxford University Press, 1982)
- Aaron L. Friedberg, *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000)
- Trachtenberg, Marc. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement 1945-1963*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Brands, Hal. *What Good Is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- Brendan Rittenhouse Green, “Two Concepts of Liberty: U.S. Cold War Grand Strategies and the Liberal Tradition,” *International Security* 37, no. 2 (2012): 9–43.
- Kim, Dong Jung. “Choosing the Right Sidekick: Economic Complements to US Military Grand Strategies.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 899–921.

25 Oct: China

This is the first day of the rest of the class. Student groups are running the show from here on out. The entire class is still required to do the required readings. I am looking for evidence that the readings inform your discussion of the case, even if it's not your week to present. The recommended readings may be helpful for you if you are presenting, but please feel free to research other sources as I do not pretend to be an expert on all regions. The China groups get more help with recommended reading because they are going first. You're welcome. Be careful not to be misled by Singer and Cole's novel!

- Randall L. Schweller and Xiaoyu Pu, "After Unipolarity: China's Visions of International Order in an Era of U.S. Decline," *International Security* vol. 36, no. 1 (2011): 41-72
 - Does Chinese nationalism make any of these visions more likely?
 - Recommended: Johnston, Alastair Iain. “Is Chinese Nationalism Rising? Evidence from Beijing.” *International Security* 41, no. 3 (January 1, 2017): 7–43.
- Fravel, M. Taylor. “Shifts in Warfare and Party Unity: Explaining China's Changes in Military Strategy.” *International Security* 42, no. 3 (January 1, 2018): 37–83.

- Recommended: State Council Information Office. “China’s Military Strategy.” Beijing: The State Council Information Office of the People’s Republic of China, May 2015. http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2015-05/26/content_20820628.htm. See also State Council policy white papers: <http://english.gov.cn/archive/whitepaper/> This is what the CCP says its military strategy is. Read this critically. What is it not saying? Who is the audience? What is the difference between a state’s grand strategy and public declaratory policy?
- Lind, Jennifer, and Daryl G. Press. “Markets or Mercantilism? How China Secures Its Energy Supplies.” *International Security* 42, no. 04 (May 1, 2018): 170–204.
- Char, James. “Reclaiming the Party’s Control of the Gun: Bringing Civilian Authority Back in China’s Civil-Military Relations.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 608–36.
 - See also: Miller, Alice L. “Valedictory: Analyzing The Chinese Leadership In An Era Of Sex, Money, And Power.” *China Leadership Monitor*, no. 57 (August 29, 2018). <https://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/research/docs/clm57-am-final.pdf>.
 - See also: Mulvenon, James C. ““Like Donkeys Slaughtered After They Are Too Old to Work a Grindstone’: PLA Veterans Protests and Party-Military Relations Under Xi Jinping.” *China Leadership Monitor* 57 (Fall 2018). <https://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/research/docs/clm57-jm-edited-final.pdf>.

Recommended—Chinese Grand Strategy

- Shambaugh, David. “U.S.-China Rivalry in Southeast Asia: Power Shift or Competitive Coexistence?” *International Security* 42, no. 04 (May 1, 2018): 85–127.
- Mastro, Oriana Skylar. “Why China Won’t Rescue North Korea.” *Foreign Affairs*, December 12, 2017. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2017-12-12/why-china-wont-rescue-north-korea>
- Easley, Leif-Eric, and In Young Park. “China’s Norms in Its near Abroad: Understanding Beijing’s North Korea Policy.” *Journal of Contemporary China* 25, no. 101 (September 2, 2016): 651–68.
- McReynolds, Joe, ed. *China’s Evolving Military Strategy*. Jamestown Foundation, 2016.
- Michael D. Swaine, “Xi Jinping on Chinese Foreign Relations: The Governance of China and Chinese Commentary,” *China Leadership Monitor* no. 48 (9 September 2015), <http://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/research/docs/clm48ms.pdf>
- Mearsheimer, John J. “Can China Rise Peacefully?” *The National Interest*, October 25, 2014. <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/can-china-rise-peacefully-10204>.
- Wang Jisi, “China’s Search for a Grand Strategy: A Rising Great Power Finds Its Way,” *Foreign Affairs* (March/April 2011)
- Alastair Iain Johnston, “Is China a Status Quo Power?” *International Security* vol. 27, no. 4 (2003): 5-56
- Zeng, Jinghan, Yuefan Xiao, and Shaun Breslin. “Securing China’s Core Interests: The State of the Debate in China.” *International Affairs* 91, no. 2 (March 1, 2015): 245–66.
- Andrew J. Nathan and Andrew Scobell, “How China Sees America,” *Foreign Affairs*, August 16, 2012.

- Ying, Fu. "How China Sees Russia." *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 1 (February 2016): 96–105.
- Liff, Adam P., and G. John Ikenberry. "Racing toward Tragedy?: China's Rise, Military Competition in the Asia Pacific, and the Security Dilemma." *International Security* 39, no. 2 (October 1, 2014)
- M. Taylor Fravel, "International Relations Theory and China's Rise: Assessing China's Potential for Territorial Expansion," *International Studies Review* vol. 12, no. 4 (2010): 505-532
- Avery Goldstein, "Power Transitions, Institutions, and China's Rise in East Asia: Theoretical Expectations and Evidence," *Journal of Strategic Studies* vol. 30, no. 4 (2007): 639-682
- Ross, Robert S. "China's Naval Nationalism: Sources, Prospects, and the U. S. Response." *International Security* 34, no. 2 (October 1, 2009): 46–81.
- Robert S. Ross, "Balance of Power Politics and the Rise of China: Accommodation and Balancing in East Asia," *Security Studies* 15, no. 3 (2006): 355–395.
- Chong, Ja Ian, and Todd H. Hall. "The Lessons of 1914 for East Asia Today: Missing the Trees for the Forest." *International Security* 39, no. 1 (July 1, 2014): 7–43.
- Kastner, Scott L., Margaret M. Pearson, and Chad Rector. "Invest, Hold Up, or Accept? China in Multilateral Governance." *Security Studies* 25, no. 1 (January 2, 2016): 142–79.
- Griffiths, Ryan D. "States, Nations, and Territorial Stability: Why Chinese Hegemony Would Be Better for International Order." *Security Studies* 25, no. 3 (July 2, 2016): 519–45.

Recommended—Chinese Military Power

- Talmadge, Caitlin. "Would China Go Nuclear? Assessing the Risk of Chinese Nuclear Escalation in a Conventional War with the United States." *International Security* 41, no. 4 (April 1, 2017): 50–92.
- Heginbotham, Eric, Michael Nixon, Forrest E. Morgan, Jacob Heim, Jeff Hagen, Sheng Li, Jeffrey Engstrom, et al. *The U.S.-China Military Scorecard*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2015. http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR392.html
- Heath, Timothy R., Kristen Gunness, and Cortez A. Cooper. "The PLA and China's Rejuvenation: National Security and Military Strategies, Deterrence Concepts, and Combat Capabilities." Product Page. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2016. http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1402.html.
- Cunningham, Fiona S., and M. Taylor Fravel. "Assuring Assured Retaliation: China's Nuclear Posture and U.S.-China Strategic Stability." *International Security* 40, no. 2 (October 1, 2015): 7–50.
- Kastner, Scott L. "Is the Taiwan Strait Still a Flash Point? Rethinking the Prospects for Armed Conflict between China and Taiwan." *International Security* 40, no. 3 (January 1, 2016): 54–92.
- Biddle, Stephen, and Ivan Oelrich. "Future Warfare in the Western Pacific: Chinese Antiaccess/Area Denial, U.S. AirSea Battle, and Command of the Commons in East Asia." *International Security* 41, no. 1 (July 1, 2016): 7–48.
- Erickson, Andrew S. "Rising Tide, Dispersing Waves: Opportunities and Challenges for Chinese Seapower Development." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37, no. 3 (April 16, 2014): 372–402.
- Pollpeter, Kevin. "Space, the New Domain: Space Operations and Chinese Military Reforms." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 709–27.
- Blasko, Dennis J. "Integrating the Services and Harnessing the Military Area Commands." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 685–708.

- You, Ji. “The Sino-US ‘Cat-and-Mouse’ Game Concerning Freedom of Navigation and Flights: An Analysis of Chinese Perspectives.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 637–61.

Recommended—US-China Relations

- Thomas J. Christensen, “Posing Problems Without Catching Up: China’s Rise and Challenges For U.S. Security Policy,” *International Security* vol. 25, no. 4 (2001): 5-40
- Brooks, Stephen G., and William C. Wohlforth. “The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers in the Twenty-First Century: China’s Rise and the Fate of America’s Global Position.” *International Security* 40, no. 3 (January 1, 2016): 7–53.
- Silove, Nina. “The Pivot before the Pivot: U.S. Strategy to Preserve the Power Balance in Asia.” *International Security* 40, no. 4 (April 1, 2016): 45–88.
- Glaser, Charles L. “A U.S.-China Grand Bargain?: The Hard Choice between Military Competition and Accommodation.” *International Security* 39, no. 4 (2015): 49–90.
- Saunders, Phillip C., and Julia G. Bowie. “US–China Military Relations: Competition and Cooperation.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 662–84.
- Green, Michael, Kathleen Hicks, Zack Cooper, John Schaus, and Jake Douglas. “Countering Coercion in Maritime Asia: The Theory and Practice of Gray Zone Deterrence.” Washington DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, May 2017.
<https://www.csis.org/analysis/countering-coercion-maritime-asia>. Chapter 1.

Recommended—Chinese Defense Politics

- Swaine, Michael D. “Xi Jinping’s Address to the Central Conference on Work Relating to Foreign Affairs: Assessing and Advancing Major Power Diplomacy with Chinese Characteristics.” *China Leadership Monitor*, no. 46 (March 19, 2015).
<http://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/clm46ms.pdf>.
- Andrew Scobell, “China’s Evolving Civil-Military Relations: Creeping Guojiahua,” *Armed Forces & Society* vol. 31, no. 2 (2005): 227 – 243
- Shambaugh, David. “The Coming Chinese Crackup.” *Wall Street Journal*, March 6, 2015, sec. Life.
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-coming-chinese-crack-up-1425659198>
- Pollpeter, Kevin, and Kenneth W. Allen, eds. *The PLA as Organization v2.0*. Washington, D.C.: Defense Group Inc., 2015. http://www.rand.org/pubs/conf_proceedings/CF182.html.
- Cheung, Tai Ming. “The Chinese Defense Economy’s Long March from Imitation to Innovation.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 34, no. 3 (2011): 325–54
- Blasko, Dennis J. “‘Technology Determines Tactics’: The Relationship between Technology and Doctrine in Chinese Military Thinking.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 34, no. 3 (2011): 355–81.
- Meidan, Michal. “The Implications of China’s Energy-Import Boom.” *Survival* 56, no. 3 (May 4, 2014): 179–200.
- Bitzinger, Richard A. “Reforming China’s Defense Industry.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 762–89.
- Cheung, Tai Ming. “Innovation in China’s Defense Technology Base: Foreign Technology and Military Capabilities.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 39, no. 5–6 (September 18, 2016): 728–61.

1 Nov: Japan

One of the most militarist of states in history is now the most pacifist—how do we explain this change? Is it durable? What are the causes and consequences of Japanese “normalization”? How do North Korean nuclearization and the credibility of American alliance commitments shape Japanese policy? Some of the readings above in the China section are quite relevant to Japan vis-à-vis threats in its neighborhood and the US alliance.

- Midford, P. “The Logic of Reassurance and Japan’s Grand Strategy.” *Security Studies* 11, no. 3 (March 1, 2002): 1–43.
- Izumikawa, Yasuhiro. “Explaining Japanese Antimilitarism: Normative and Realist Constraints on Japan’s Security Policy.” *International Security* 35, no. 2 (September 17, 2010): 123–60.
- Jacques E.C. Hymans, “Veto Players, Nuclear Energy, and Nonproliferation: Domestic Institutional Barriers to a Japanese Bomb,” *International Security* vol. 36, no. 2 (2010): 154-189
- Heginbotham, Eric, and Richard J. Samuels. “Active Denial: Redesigning Japan’s Response to China’s Military Challenge.” *International Security* 42, no. 4 (May 1, 2018): 128–69.
 - See also: Beckley, Michael. “The Emerging Military Balance in East Asia: How China’s Neighbors Can Check Chinese Naval Expansion.” *International Security* 42, no. 2

Recommended

- Thomas Christensen, “China, the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia,” *International Security* vol. 23, no. 4 (1999): 49-80
- Twomey, Christopher P. “Japan, a Circumscribed Balancer: Building on Defensive Realism to Make Predictions about East Asian Security.” *Security Studies* 9, no. 4 (June 1, 2000): 167–205.
- Cha, Victor D. “Powerplay: Origins of the U.S. Alliance System in Asia.” *International Security* 34, no. 3 (January 1, 2010): 158–96.
- Choong, William. “Defence and Japan’s Constitutional Debate.” *Survival* 57, no. 2 (March 4, 2015): 173–92.
- Beckley, Michael. “The Myth of Entangling Alliances: Reassessing the Security Risks of U.S. Defense Pacts.” *International Security* 39, no. 4 (2015): 7–48.
- Patalano, Alessio. “Japan as a Seapower: Strategy, Doctrine, and Capabilities under Three Defence Reviews, 1995–2010.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37, no. 3 (April 16, 2014): 403–41.
- Ayson, Robert, and Desmond Ball. “Can a Sino-Japanese War Be Controlled?” *Survival* 56, no. 6 (November 2, 2014): 135–66.
- Mochizuki, Mike M. “Japan’s Shifting Strategy toward the Rise of China.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 30, no. 4–5 (August 1, 2007): 739–76.
- Heng, Yee-Kuang. “Smart Power and Japan’s Self-Defense Forces.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 38, no. 3 (April 16, 2015): 282–308.
- Peter J. Katzenstein and Nobuo Okawara, “Japan, Asian-Pacific Security, and the Case for Analytical Eclecticism,” *International Security* 26, no. 3 (2001): 153–185.
- Llewelyn Hughes, “Why Japan Will Not Go Nuclear (Yet): International and Domestic Constraints on the Nuclearization of Japan,” *International Security* vol. 31, no. 4 (2007): 67-96

- Richard J. Samuels, “‘New Fighting Power!’ Japan’s Growing Maritime Capabilities and East Asian Security,” *International Security* 32, no. 3 (2007): 84–112.
- Richard Samuels, *Securing Japan: Tokyo’s Grand Strategy and the Future of East Asia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 2008)
- Kent E. Calder, “Securing Security Through Prosperity: The San Francisco System in Comparative Perspective,” *Pacific Review* vol. 17, no. 1 (2004): 135–157
- Ward, Steven. “Race, Status, and Japanese Revisionism in the Early 1930s.” *Security Studies* 22, no. 4 (October 1, 2013): 607–39.

8 Nov: No Class Meeting this Week

The next sessions involve particularly complex states and regions balancing internal and external threats. Use this week to prepare. We will also divide up into analytical teams for the final scenario workshop. Use this week to start researching the position of your state(s).

15 Nov: Israel

Israel is a small democracy, with advanced technical capabilities, in a tough neighborhood, with complex internal politics, engaged in frequent counterterrorism and counterinsurgency operations, managing controversial alliances, conducting active cyber operations, and its nuclear deterrent is an open secret. Thinking through this case requires you to also think through the strategies of the state and non-state actors in and around Israel.

- Dmitry (Dima) Adamsky, “From Israel with Deterrence: Strategic Culture, Intra-War Coercion and Brute Force.” *Security Studies* 26, no. 1 (January 2, 2017): 157–84.
 - Historical context: Sobelman, Daniel. “Learning to Deter: Deterrence Failure and Success in the Israel-Hezbollah Conflict, 2006–16.” *International Security* 41, no. 3 (January 1, 2017): 151–96.
- Atzili, Boaz, and Wendy Pearlman. “Triadic Deterrence: Coercing Strength, Beaten by Weakness.” *Security Studies* 21, no. 2 (April 1, 2012): 301–35.
- Wendy Pearlman, “Spoiling Inside and Out: Internal Political Contestation and the Middle East Peace Process.” *International Security* 33, no. 3 (January 1, 2009): 79–109.
 - Recommended: Kobi Michael, “Who Really Dictates What an Existential Threat Is? The Israeli Experience.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 32, no. 5 (October 1, 2009): 687–713.
- Zeev Maoz, “The Mixed Blessing of Israel’s Nuclear Policy.” *International Security* 28, no. 2 (October 1, 2003): 44–77.
 - Counterpoint: Beres, Louis René, and Zeev Maoz. “Israel and the Bomb.” *International Security* 29, no. 1 (July 1, 2004): 175–80.

Recommended

- Mendelsohn, Barak. “Israel and Its Messianic Right: Path Dependency and State Authority in International Conflict.” *International Studies Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (March 1, 2016): 47–58.
- Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. “Is It Love or The Lobby? Explaining America’s Special Relationship with Israel.” *Security Studies* 18, no. 1 (2009): 58–78.

- Peffley, Mark, Marc L. Hutchison, and Michal Shamir. "The Impact of Persistent Terrorism on Political Tolerance: Israel, 1980 to 2011." *American Political Science Review* 109, no. 4 (November 2015): 817–832.
- Petrelli, Niccolò. "Deterring Insurgents: Culture, Adaptation and the Evolution of Israeli Counterinsurgency, 1987–2005." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 36, no. 5 (October 1, 2013): 666–91.
- Cohen, Matthew S., Charles D. Freilich, and Gabi Siboni. "Israel and Cyberspace: Unique Threat and Response." *International Studies Perspectives* 17, no. 3 (August 1, 2016): 307–21.
- Byman, Daniel. "Do Targeted Killings Work?" *Foreign Affairs* 85, no. 2 (2006): 95–111.
- Hassner, Ron E., and Jason Wittenberg. "Barriers to Entry: Who Builds Fortified Boundaries and Why?" *International Security* 40, no. 1 (July 1, 2015): 157–90.
- Jones, Clive. "Israel's Security Nexus as Strategic Restraint: The Case of Iran 2009–2013." *Journal of Strategic Studies* (December 10, 2015): 1–22.
- Kaplan, Edward H., Alex Mintz, Shaul Mishal, and Claudio Samban. "What Happened to Suicide Bombings in Israel? Insights from a Terror Stock Model." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 28, no. 3 (2005): 225–35.
- Adamsky, Dima. *The Culture of Military Innovation: The Impact of Cultural Factors on the Revolution in Military Affairs in Russia, the US, and Israel*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Rabinowitz, Or, and Nicholas L. Miller. "Keeping the Bombs in the Basement: U.S. Nonproliferation Policy toward Israel, South Africa, and Pakistan." *International Security* 40, no. 1 (July 1, 2015): 47–86.
- Bar-Joseph, Uri, and Amr Yossef. "The Hidden Factors That Turned the Tide: Strategic Decision-Making and Operational Intelligence in the 1973 War." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37, no. 4 (June 7, 2014): 584–608.
- Brands, Hal, and David Palkki. "Saddam, Israel, and the Bomb: Nuclear Alarmism Justified?" *International Security* 36, no. 1 (July 1, 2011): 133–66.
- Braut-Hegghammer, Målfrid. "Revisiting Osirak: Preventive Attacks and Nuclear Proliferation Risks." *International Security* 36, no. 1 (July 1, 2011): 101–32.

22 Nov: Pakistan

South Asia exemplifies the novel challenge of the Second Nuclear Age. Pakistan and India should be examined together. How does Pakistan balance its internal and external, and state and non-state, threats (are these the same)?

- Paul, T. V. "Why Has the India-Pakistan Rivalry Been so Enduring? Power Asymmetry and an Intractable Conflict." *Security Studies* 15, no. 4 (December 1, 2006): 600–630.
- Sankaran, Jaganath. "Pakistan's Battlefield Nuclear Policy: A Risky Solution to an Exaggerated Threat." *International Security* 39, no. 3 (January 1, 2015): 118–51.
 - See also: Vipin Narang, "Posturing for Peace? Pakistan's Nuclear Postures and South Asian Stability," *International Security* vol. 34, no. 3 (2010): 38–78
- Paul Staniland, "Explaining Civil-Military Relations in Complex Political Environments: India and Pakistan in Comparative Perspective," *Security Studies* vol. 17, no. 2 (2008): 322–362
 - Recommended: Kapur, S. Paul, and Sumit Ganguly. "The Jihad Paradox: Pakistan and Islamist Militancy in South Asia." *International Security* 37, no. 1 (July 1, 2012): 111–41.

Recommended

- Montgomery, Evan Braden, and Eric S. Edelman. "Rethinking Stability in South Asia: India, Pakistan, and the Competition for Escalation Dominance." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 38, no. 1–2 (January 2, 2015): 159–82.
- Shapiro, Jacob N., and C. Christine Fair. "Understanding Support for Islamist Militancy in Pakistan." *International Security* 34, no. 3 (January 1, 2010): 79–118.
- Sumit Ganguly, "Nuclear Stability in South Asia," *International Security* vol. 33, no. 2 (2008): 45–70
- S. Paul Kapur, "Ten Years of Instability in a Nuclear South Asia," *International Security* vol. 33, no. 2 (2008): 71–94
- T.V. Paul, ed., *The India-Pakistan Conflict* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Ayesha Siddiqi, "Pakistan's Counterterrorism Strategy: Separating Friends from Enemies," *Washington Quarterly* vol. 34, no. 1 (2011): 149-162
- C. Christine Fair and Seth G. Jones, "Pakistan's War Within," *Survival* vol. 51, no. 5 (2009)
- T.V. Paul, *South Asia's Weak States: Understanding the Regional Insecurity Predicament* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010)
- Sumit Ganguly, *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions since 1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001)
- P.R. Chari, Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema and Stephen P. Cohen, *Four Crises and a Peace Process: American Engagement in South Asia* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2007)
- Ashley J. Tellis, "The Merits of Dehyphenation: Explaining U.S. Success in Engaging India and Pakistan," *Washington Quarterly* vol. 31, no. 4 (2008): 21-42

29 Nov: Russia

Great power politics is back in Europe, this time with new "gray zone" characteristics. Thinking through Russian strategy requires us to think through a security dilemma with NATO and thus NATO and US grand strategy as it affects and is perceived by Moscow. (How) do Russian aims differ from Soviet aims during the Cold War?

- Putin, Vladimir. "Address by President of the Russian Federation." Russian State Duma, March 18, 2014, <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/6889>
 - Is VVP a key explanatory factor for Russian policy (or, alternatively, would any Russian leader make similar decisions in this situation)? See also: Ioffe, Julia. "What Putin Really Wants." *The Atlantic*, February 2018. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/01/putins-game/546548/>
- Mearsheimer, John J. "Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault: The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin." *Foreign Affairs*, October 2014.
 - Does Mearsheimer have a sober view of Europe or is he buying into Putin propaganda? See the debate on this article: McFaul, Michael, Stephen Sestanovich, and John J. Mearsheimer. "Faulty Powers: Who Started the Ukraine Crisis?" *Foreign Affairs*, December 2014.
- Kristine Ven Bruusgaard, "Russian Strategic Deterrence," *Survival*, 2016, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 7-26.

- On the cross-domain aspect of Russian strategy: Lanoszka, Alexander. “Russian Hybrid Warfare and Extended Deterrence in Eastern Europe.” *International Affairs* 92, no. 1 (2016): 175–95.
- Another take on nuclear issues: Oliker, Olga. “Russia’s Nuclear Doctrine: What We Know, What We Don’t, and What That Means.” Center for Strategic and International Studies. May 2016. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/russia%E2%80%99s-nuclear-doctrine>
- Dawisha, Karen. “Is Russia’s Foreign Policy that of a Corporatist-Kleptocratic Regime?” *Post-Soviet Affairs* 27, no. 4 (2011): 331–65.
 - Bureaucratic politics in the Russian intelligence agencies: Galeotti, Mark. “Putin’s Hydra: Inside Russia’s Intelligence Services.” Policy Brief. London: European Council on Foreign Relations, May 11, 2016, [http://www.ecfr.eu/page/-/ECFR_169 - PUTINS HYDRA INSIDE THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICES 1513.pdf](http://www.ecfr.eu/page/-/ECFR_169_-_PUTINS_HYDRA_INSIDE_THE_RUSSIAN_INTELLIGENCE_SERVICES_1513.pdf)

Recommended

- Adamsky, Dmitry (Dima). “From Moscow with Coercion: Russian Deterrence Theory and Strategic Culture.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 0, no. 0 (July 24, 2017): 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2017.1347872>.
- Adamsky, Dmitry. “Nuclear Incoherence: Deterrence Theory and Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons in Russia.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37, no. 1 (2014): 91–134.
- Saivetz, Carol R. “The Ties That Bind? Russia’s Evolving Relations with Its Neighbors.” *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 45, no. 3–4 (2012): 401–12.
- Matthew Kroening, “Facing Reality: Getting NATO Ready for a New Cold War,” *Survival*, vol. 57, no. 1, February 2015, pp. 49–70
- Roger McDermot, “Does Russian Hybrid Warfare Really Exist?,” *Eurasia Daily Monitor*, vol. 12, issue 103, 3 June 2015.
- Šmíd, Tomáš, and Miroslav Mareš. “‘Kadyrovtsy’: Russia’s Counterinsurgency Strategy and the Wars of Paramilitary Clans.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 38, no. 5 (July 29, 2015): 650–77.
- Driscoll, Jesse, and Daniel Maliniak. “With Friends Like These: Brinkmanship and Chain-Ganging in Russia’s Near Abroad.” *Security Studies* 25, no. 4 (October 1, 2016): 585–607.
- Freedman, Lawrence. “Ukraine and the Art of Limited War.” *Survival* 56, no. 6 (November 2, 2014): 7–38.
- Freedman, Lawrence. “Ukraine and the Art of Crisis Management.” *Survival* 56, no. 3 (May 4, 2014): 7–42.
- Laruelle, Marlene. “The Three Colors of Novorossiia, or the Russian Nationalist Mythmaking of the Ukrainian Crisis.” *Post-Soviet Affairs* (March 20, 2015): 1–20.
- Larson, Deborah Welch, and Alexei Shevchenko. “Status Seekers: Chinese and Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy.” *International Security* 34, no. 4 (2010): 63–95.
- Bukkvoll, Tor. “Iron Cannot Fight – The Role of Technology in Current Russian Military Theory.” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 34, no. 5 (2011): 681–706.
- Deibert R.J, Rohozinski R, and Crete-Nishihata M. “Cyclones in Cyberspace: Information Shaping and Denial in the 2008 Russia-Georgia War.” *Security Dialogue* 43, no. 1 (2012): 3–24.
- Deudney, Daniel, and G. John Ikenberry. “The Unravelling of the Cold War Settlement.” *Survival* 51, no. 6 (2009): 39–62.
- Ferguson, Chaka. “The Strategic Use of Soft Balancing: The Normative Dimensions of the Chinese–Russian ‘Strategic Partnership.’” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 35, no. 2 (2012): 197–222.

- Gustafson, Thane. “Putin’s Petroleum Problem: How Oil Is Holding Russia Back—and How It Could Save It.” *Foreign Affairs*, December 2012.
- McFaul, Michael. “A Precarious Peace: Domestic Politics in the Making of Russian Foreign Policy.” *International Security* 22, no. 3 (1998): 5–35.
- Monaghan, Andrew. “Putin’s Russia: Shaping a ‘grand Strategy’?.” *International Affairs* 89, no. 5 (2013): 1221–36.
- Neumann, Iver B., and Vincent Pouliot. “Untimely Russia: Hysteresis in Russian-Western Relations over the Past Millennium.” *Security Studies* 20, no. 1 (2011): 105–37.
- Porter, Bruce D., and Carol R. Saivetz. “The Once and Future Empire: Russia and the ‘Near Abroad.’” *The Washington Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (1994): 75–90.
- Steff, Reuben, and Nicholas Khoo. “Hard Balancing in the Age of American Unipolarity: The Russian Response to US Ballistic Missile Defense during the Bush Administration (2001–2008).” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37, no. 2 (2014): 222–58.
- Sarotte, Mary Elise. “Perpetuating U.S. Preeminence: The 1990 Deals to ‘Bribe the Soviets Out’ and Move NATO In.” *International Security* 35, no. 1 (2010): 110–37.
- Shiffrin, Joshua R. Itzkowitz. “Deal or No Deal? The End of the Cold War and the U.S. Offer to Limit NATO Expansion.” *International Security* 40, no. 4 (April 1, 2016): 7–44.
- Herspring, Dale. “Civil—Military Relations in the United States and Russia An Alternative Approach.” *Armed Forces & Society* 35, no. 4 (July 1, 2009): 667–87.

6 Dec: Scenario Workshop

For the final session, you will be presented with a series of provocations involving Russia and NATO. For the purposes of this scenario, you are all analysts at CSIS working in teams who have been diligently consuming news and intelligence on different regions (so start reading as soon as you receive assignments!). Your job is to imagine and provide informed comment on how you expect the state(s) to act in the given situation. This is not a simulation in the sense that you are making moves in a scenario. You are not playing a game against other groups to “win” a crisis. You are telling us how you think your state(s) will behave. Students will be assigned into teams (Russia, US, UK, Central NATO, Eastern NATO) to discuss possible responses. We are especially interested in how and whether crisis strategy is consistent with grand strategy.

Groups will be expected to provide a short 1-2pp assessment of their actor’s position on the crisis two days before the class meeting. Please upload this to the portal, stating your actor’s interests and declaratory policy with regard to the crisis scenario (which I will provide).

Appendix

Here is some material on different states from previous iterations of this seminar.

North Korea

This is the poster child for the second nuclear age. The most insular state in the world now has the most dangerous weapon in history. The strongest state in history extends its nuclear umbrella to this state’s enduring rival, and may be tempted to launch preventative war. What does North Korea, or Kim Jung Un, really want?

- Sagan, Scott D. “The Korean Missile Crisis.” *Foreign Affairs*, September 10, 2017.
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/north-korea/2017-09-10/korean-missile-crisis>.

- Narang, Vipin. “Why Kim Jong Un Wouldn’t Be Irrational to Use a Nuclear Bomb First.” *Washington Post*, September 8, 2017.
- Panda, Ankit, and Vipin Narang. “North Korea’s ICBM: A New Missile and a New Era.” *War on the Rocks* (blog), July 6, 2017. <https://warontherocks.com/2017/07/north-koreas-icbm-a-new-missile-and-a-new-era/>.
- Davis, Paul K., Peter A. Wilson, Jeongeun Kim, and JunHo Park. “Deterrence and Stability for the Korean Peninsula.” *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis* 28, no. 1 (2016): 1–23.
- Easley, Leif-Eric. “North Korean Identity as a Challenge to East Asia’s Regional Order.” *Korean Social Science Journal* 44 (2017): 51–71.
- Daniel Byman and Jennifer Lind, “Pyongyang’s Survival Strategy: Tools of Authoritarian Control in North Korea,” *International Security* 35, no. 1 (2010): 44–74.

Recommended

- Fifield, Anna. “A New Film Captures North Korea’s ‘Bold and Audacious’ Millennials.” *Washington Post*, December 15, 2017, sec. WorldViews. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/12/15/the-jangmadang-generation-new-film-shows-how-millennials-are-changing-north-korea/>.
- David C. Kang, “They Think They’re Normal: Enduring Questions and New Research on North Korea—a Review Essay,” *International Security* vol. 36, no. 3 (2012): 142-171
- Jackson, Van. “Threat Consensus and Rapprochement Failure: Revisiting the Collapse of US–North Korea Relations, 1994–2002.” *Foreign Policy Analysis*, April 13, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/orw034>.
- Jun, Jenny, Scott LaFoy, and Ethan Sohn. “North Korea’s Cyber Operations.” Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, December 2015. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/north-korea%E2%80%99s-cyber-operations>
- Christopher Hughes, “North Korea’s Nuclear Weapons: Implications for the Nuclear Ambitions of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan,” *Asia Policy* vol. 3 (2007): 75-104
- Lee, Seung-Ook. “A Geo-Economic Object or an Object of Geo-Political Absorption? Competing Visions of North Korea in South Korean Politics.” *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 0, no. 0 (March 23, 2015): 1–22.
- Insoo Kim, “Intra-Military Divisions and Democratization in South Korea,” *Armed Forces & Society* 39, no. 4 (2013): 695–710.
- Bruce W. Bennett and Jennifer Lind, “The Collapse of North Korea: Military Missions and Requirements,” *International Security* 36, no. 2 (2011): 84–119.
- Stephan Haggard, “The Political Economy of the Asian Welfare State,” in Richard Boyd and Takwin Ngo, eds. *Asian States: Beyond the Developmental Perspective* (London: Routledge, 2005)
- Bruce B. Cumings, “The Origins and Development of the Northeast Asia Political Economy: Industrial Sectors, Product Cycles and Political Consequences,” *International Organization* vol. 38, no. 1 (1984): 1-22

South Korea

This week we look at the other half of the Korean Peninsula. ROK emerged devastated from the Korean War and developed through a series of authoritarian governments to become one of the most economically productive democracies in the world. The contrast with the North today, politically isolated and chronically malnourished, could not be more extreme. How do we exchange the changes in ROK policy, and how does ROK manage relations with its unfriendly neighbor to the north?

- Easley, Leif-Eric, and Kyuri Park. "South Korea's Mismatched Diplomacy in Asia: Middle Power Identity, Interests, and Foreign Policy." *International Politics*, October 19, 2017, 1–22.
- Snyder, Scott A., and Leif-Eric Easley. "South Korea's Foreign Relations and Security Policies." In *The Oxford Handbook of the International Relations of Asia*, edited by Saadia Pekkanen, John Ravenhill, and Rosemary Foot, 446–61. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Insoo Kim, "Intra-Military Divisions and Democratization in South Korea," *Armed Forces & Society* 39, no. 4 (2013): 695–710.
- Refresh from week 4: Etel Solingen, "Pax Asiatica Versus Bella Levantina: The Foundations of War and Peace in East Asia and the Middle East," *American Political Science Review* vol. 101, no. 4 (2007): 757-780

Recommended

- Kim Euikon. "Korea's Middle-Power Diplomacy in the 21st Century." *Pacific Focus* 30, no. 1 (April 8, 2015): 1–9.
- Straub, David. "The Trump Administration's Korea Policy in Historical Context." Sejong Policy Briefing. Seoul: The Sejong Institute, June 27, 2017.
- Christopher Hughes, "North Korea's Nuclear Weapons: Implications for the Nuclear Ambitions of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan," *Asia Policy* vol. 3 (2007): 75-104
- Lee, Seung-Ook. "A Geo-Economic Object or an Object of Geo-Political Absorption? Competing Visions of North Korea in South Korean Politics." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 0, no. 0 (March 23, 2015): 1–22.

Canada

Can a middle power have a grand strategy?

- Tremblay, Éric, and Bill Bentley. "Canada's Strategic Culture: Grand Strategy and the Utility of Force." *Canadian Military Journal* 15, no. 3 (2015): 5–17.
- Jockel, Joseph T., and Joel J. Sokolsky. "Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa In, Expenses Down, Criticism Out... and the Country Secure." *International Journal* 64, no. 2 (June 1, 2009): 315–36.
- Leuprecht, Christian, and Joel J. Sokolsky. "Defense Policy 'Walmart Style' Canadian Lessons in 'not-so-Grand' Grand Strategy." *Armed Forces & Society* 41, no. 3 (July 1, 2015): 541–62.

Recommended

- Caravaggio, Angelo N. "Grand Strategy Symposium Overview." Toronto: Centre for National Security Studies at the Canadian Forces College, April 2011.
- Kawasaki, Tsyoshi. "Formulating Canada's Grand Strategy in Asia." *International Journal* 56, no. 1 (2000): 135–48.

- Kinsman, Jeremy. "Who Is My Neighbour? Trudeau and Foreign Policy." *London Journal of Canadian Studies* 18 (2002): 103–120.
- Stein, Janice Gross, and J. Eugene Lang. *The Unexpected War: Canada in Kandahar*. Penguin Canada, 2008.
- Trudgen, Matthew. "A Canadian Approach: Canada's Cold War Grand Strategy, 1945 to 1989." *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 14, no. 3&4 (2012): 1–27.
- Platt, Victor. "Still the Fire-Proof House? An Analysis of Canada's Cyber Security Strategy." *International Journal* 67, no. 1 (2011): 155–67.
- Ross, Douglas Alan. "Canada's International Security Strategy: Beyond Reason but Not Hope?" *International Journal* 65, no. 2 (2010): 349–60.
- Ettinger, Aaron, and Jeffrey Rice. "Hell Is Other People's Schedules: Canada's Limited-Term Military Commitments, 2001–2015." *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 71, no. 3 (September 1, 2016): 371–92.
- Charron, Andrea. "Canada, the Arctic, and NORAD: Status Quo or New Ball Game?" *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 70, no. 2 (June 1, 2015): 215–31.
- Paris, Roland. "Are Canadians Still Liberal Internationalists? Foreign Policy and Public Opinion in the Harper Era." *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 69, no. 3 (September 1, 2014): 274–307.
- Fergusson, James. "The NORAD Conundrum: Canada, Missile Defence, and Military Space." *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 70, no. 2 (June 1, 2015): 196–

Islamic State (Daesh)

How can we use the concepts developed for states to think about the grand strategies of nonstate (or quasi state) actors?

- Byman, Daniel. "Understanding the Islamic State—A Review Essay." *International Security* 40, no. 4 (April 1, 2016): 127–65.
- Jung, Danielle F., Pat Ryan, Jacob N. Shapiro, and Jon Wallace. "Managing a Transnational Insurgency: The Islamic State of Iraq's 'Paper Trail,' 2005-2010." Occasional Paper Series. West Point, NY: Combating Terrorism Center, December 15, 2014, <https://www.ctc.usma.edu/v2/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Managing-a-Transnational-Insurgency-ISI-FINAL1.pdf>
 - The full book-length study is highly recommended: Johnston, Patrick B., Jacob N. Shapiro, Howard Shatz, Benjamin Bahney, Danielle F. Jung, Patrick Ryan, and Jonathan Wallace. *Foundations of the Islamic State*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2016, http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1192.html
- Review your notes from Global Security:
 - Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter, "The Strategies of Terrorism," *International Security* 31, no. 1 (2006): 49–80
 - Max Abrahms, "What Terrorists Really Want: Terrorist Motives and Counterterrorism Strategy," *International Security* 32, no. 4 (2008): 78–105

Recommended

- <http://isis.liveuamap.com/en>
- Anderson, Scott. "Fractured Lands: How the Arab World Came Apart." *New York Times*, August 10, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/08/11/magazine/isis-middle-east-arab-spring-fractured-lands.html>
- Ahram, Ariel I. "Sexual Violence and the Making of ISIS." *Survival* 57, no. 3 (May 4, 2015): 57–78.

- Aisha Ahmad, "Going Global: Islamist Competition in Contemporary Civil Wars" *Security Studies*, 25:2 (2016), 353-384
- Farwell, James P. "The Media Strategy of ISIS." *Survival* 56, no. 6 (November 2, 2014): 49–55.
- Holbrook, Donald. "Al-Qaeda and the Rise of ISIS." *Survival* 57, no. 2 (March 4, 2015): 93–104.
- Katagiri, Noriyuki. "ISIL, Insurgent Strategies for Statehood, and the Challenge for Security Studies." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 26, no. 3 (May 4, 2015): 542–56.
- Kfir, Isaac. "Social Identity Group and Human (In)Security: The Case of Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 38, no. 4 (April 3, 2015): 233–52.
- Turner, John. "Strategic Differences: Al Qaeda's Split with the Islamic State of Iraq and Al-Sham." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 26, no. 2 (March 4, 2015): 208–25.
- "The Jihadi Threat: ISIS, Al Qaeda and Beyond." U.S. Institute of Peace, December 2016. <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/The-Jihadi-Threat-ISIS-Al-Qaeda-and-Beyond.pdf>
- Atran, Scott. "Why ISIS Has the Potential to Be a World-Altering Revolution" *Aeon*, December 15, 2015. <https://aeon.co/essays/why-isis-has-the-potential-to-be-a-world-altering-revolution>
- Chulov, Martin. "ISIS: The inside Story," *The Guardian* (December 11, 2014), <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/dec/11/sp-isis-the-inside-story>
- Long, Jerry Mark, and Alex S. Wilner. "Delegitimizing Al-Qaida: Defeating an 'Army Whose Men Love Death.'" *International Security* 39, no. 1 (July 1, 2014): 126–64.
- Thomas Hegghammer, "The Rise of Muslim Foreign Fighters: Islam and the Globalization of Jihad," *International Security* 35, no. 3 (December 1, 2010): 53–94.
- Atran, Scott, Hammad Sheikh, and Angel Gomez, "Devoted Actors Sacrifice for Close Comrades and Sacred Cause," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, no. 50 (December 16, 2014): 17702–3
- Robert A. Pape, "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *The American Political Science Review* 97, no. 3 (2003): 343–61

India

South Asia exemplifies the novel challenge of the Second Nuclear Age. Assessment of Indian policy will require a look at Pakistan as well—what does India think drives Pakistani policy and how does Delhi react? This is also the first state that we examine with internal violent insurgency. How does Delhi balance internal and external threats? To make matters worse, India also has to think about the nonstate threats to Pakistan.

- Paul, T. V. "Why Has the India-Pakistan Rivalry Been so Enduring? Power Asymmetry and an Intractable Conflict." *Security Studies* 15, no. 4 (December 1, 2006): 600–630.
- Andrew B. Kennedy, "India's Nuclear Odyssey: Implicit Umbrellas, Diplomatic Disappointments, and the Bomb." *International Security* vol. 36, no. 2 (2011): 120-153
- Piazza, James A. "Terrorism and Party Systems in the States of India." *Security Studies* 19, no. 1 (February 26, 2010): 99–123.
- Paul Staniland, "Explaining Civil-Military Relations in Complex Political Environments: India and Pakistan in Comparative Perspective," *Security Studies* vol. 17, no. 2 (2008): 322-362

Recommended—India

- Paliwal, Avinash. "India's Taliban Dilemma: To Contain or to Engage?" *Journal of Strategic Studies* 40, no. 1–2 (January 2, 2017): 35–67.
- Narang, Vipin. "What Does It Take to Deter? Regional Power Nuclear Postures and International Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 57, no. 3 (June 1, 2013): 478–508.
- Montgomery, Evan Braden, and Eric S. Edelman. "Rethinking Stability in South Asia: India, Pakistan, and the Competition for Escalation Dominance." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 38, no. 1–2 (January 2, 2015): 159–82.
- Sethi, Manpreet. "The Indo-Canadian Nuclear Relationship: Possibilities and Challenges." *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 69, no. 1 (March 1, 2014): 35–47.
- Jing-Dong Yuan, "The Dragon and the Elephant: Chinese-Indian Relations in the 21st Century," *Washington Quarterly* vol. 30, no. 3 (2007): 131-144
- Rajesh Rajagopalan, "Force and Compromise: India's Counterinsurgency Grand Strategy," *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* vol. 30, no. 1 (2007): 75-91
- T.V. Paul, ed., *The India-Pakistan Conflict* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Stephen Cohen and Sunil Dasgupta, *Arming Without Aiming: India's Military Modernization* (Washington DC: Brookings Press, 2010)
- Kampani, Gaurav. "New Delhi's Long Nuclear Journey." *International Security* 38, no. 4 (April 1, 2014): 79–114.
- Sumit Ganguly, "Nuclear Stability in South Asia," *International Security* vol. 33, no. 2 (2008): 45–70
- S. Paul Kapur, "Ten Years of Instability in a Nuclear South Asia," *International Security* vol. 33, no. 2 (2008): 71–94
- Mistry, Dinshaw. "The Unrealized Promise of International Institutions: The Test Ban Treaty and India's Nuclear Breakout." *Security Studies* 12, no. 4 (January 1, 2003): 116–51.
- Joshi, Shashank. "Introduction: Indian Power Projection: Ambition, Arms and Influence." *Whitehall Papers* 85, no. 1 (July 3, 2015): 1–15.
- Bass, Gary J. "Bargaining Away Justice: India, Pakistan, and the International Politics of Impunity for the Bangladesh Genocide." *International Security* 41, no. 2 (October 1, 2016): 140–87.
- Joshi, Shashank. "India's Military Instrument: A Doctrine Stillborn." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 36, no. 4 (August 1, 2013): 512–40.
- Raghavan, Srinath. "Civil–Military Relations in India: The China Crisis and After." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 32, no. 1 (February 1, 2009): 149–75.
- Scott, David. "India's Aspirations and Strategy for the Indian Ocean – Securing the Waves?" *Journal of Strategic Studies* 36, no. 4 (August 1, 2013): 484–511.
- Holslag, Jonathan. "The Persistent Military Security Dilemma between China and India." *Journal of Strategic Studies* 32, no. 6 (December 1, 2009): 811–40.