

INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT AND SECURITY

Professor Ronald R. Krebs
1474 Social Sciences
rkrebs@polisci.umn.edu
Telephone: 612-624-4356

Class: Tuesday, 6:20 pm – 8:50 pm,
5 Blegen Hall
Office Hours: Tuesday, 9:30 am – 11:30 am,
or by appointment

Teaching Assistant

Jason Steck
1282 Social Sciences
jsteck@polisci.umn.edu

Office Hours: Wednesday, 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Soon after the fall of the Berlin Wall, many foresaw the birth of a new world order. Military strategy, strategic bombing and coercive diplomacy, deterrence and compellence, signaling and the escalatory ladder—these concepts, staples of Cold War thinking, were believed to be outmoded, having little relevance to the emerging world. The events of the past decade have shown how wrong this conclusion was. Military force is as pertinent to international politics as ever. Unable to reap the peace dividend that was expected to accompany the end of bipolar conflict, the United States has since 1989 repeatedly deployed its military forces across the globe—from Kuwait to Somalia to Bosnia and Kosovo to Afghanistan to Iraq. These operations have sometimes ended in apparent success, other times in failure.

This course explores central issues regarding the use of military force in international politics. Why do states turn to military force and for what purposes? What are the causes of war and peace? What renders the threat to use force credible? Can intervention in civil wars stall bloodshed and bring stability? How effective is military force compared to other tools of statecraft? How can states cope with the threat posed by would-be terrorists? What is the nature of counterinsurgency doctrine, and what are the perils of occupation? What is the future of military force in global politics? Through abstract theoretical readings, concrete historical cases, and contemporary policy debates, this course examines these questions and others.

REQUIREMENTS

Reading. The typical weekly reading load is between 125 and 175 pages. Although this is a relatively large class, we will every week engage in debates on historical cases and contemporary controversies—and seek to link them up with our more theoretical readings. The success of this course depends on your contributions! And you will not be able to participate effectively unless you have done the reading. **All assigned readings must be completed before the class meeting.**

Lectures and in-class discussions will often allude to and focus on current events and use them to illustrate common dynamics. You are strongly encouraged to read regularly the international section of a major daily newspaper, such as the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*. These are available for free on-line or, at substantially reduced rates for students, by subscription. A weekly magazine with excellent international news coverage is the *Economist*.

Writing. This course may be taken for either three or four credits. While the quantity and type of writing differ depending on which track you have selected, the expectations regarding quality are the same.

• *Track 1* (3 credits):

(a) two (2) 5 pp. papers

- These papers, closely linked to particular lectures, cases, and debates, must be written on a list of approved topics/questions. That list and a description of the requirements and expectations for the papers appear in a separate document, which will be distributed by the second week of the term.
- The instructor and the teaching assistant will *not* read drafts of these papers.
- The submitted papers must be typed, double-spaced, and printed in a 12 pt. font and with at least 1 inch margins. Nothing beyond 5 pp. will be read.
- The papers will be due at the start of the class to which their topic is linked. Late papers will be assessed an immediate deduction of *a full letter grade*; an additional 1/3 of a letter grade will be deducted for each subsequent day until the paper is submitted.

If you have written a paper for a given week, come to class prepared to present and defend your argument publicly.

(b) one (1) 3 pp. paper reacting to *The Battle of Algiers*

- The papers will be due at the start of class on Nov. 30. Late papers will be assessed an immediate deduction of *a full letter grade*; an additional 1/3 of a letter grade will be deducted for each subsequent day until the paper is submitted.
- Papers may be written on any aspect of the movie *you* find interesting/troubling. I will also distribute a list of questions to get your creative juices flowing.

(c) final exam: date and location TBA, set by U of M

• *Track 2* (4 credits):

(a) one (1) 5 pp. paper

- Instructions identical to (a), under Track 1.

(b) one (1) 3 pp. paper reacting to *The Battle of Algiers*

- Instructions identical to (b), under Track 1.

(c) final exam: date and location TBA, set by U of M

(d) 12-15 pp. research paper

- The research paper may be written on a topic of your choosing, subject to the approval of either the instructor or the teaching assistant.
- Those who opt to write the research paper should submit a 1 p. prospectus—laying out the question you are interested in, what case or cases you intend to explore, and what sources you will draw upon to complete the research in a timely fashion. Along with the prospectus, students should submit a preliminary bibliography. The prospectus and bibliography should be submitted no later than, and preferably earlier than, October 19.
- The prospectus will be graded. We expect that your ideas will be preliminary, but it should not be taken lightly. Do *some* reading in preparation for it, so that you have begun to narrow your question and make it manageable. And put a lot of time into thinking about it!
- A failure to submit the prospectus by the start of class on October 19 will result in the automatic deduction of 1/3 of a letter grade from your *research paper's final grade*. Every day after that that the prospectus has not been submitted will result in an additional deduction of 1/3 of a letter grade from the research paper's final grade.

- Include your email address on the prospectus. Either the teaching assistant or the instructor will write you by email to schedule an appointment to discuss your paper further or, if it is determined that no meeting is necessary, with comments and suggestions.
- The instructor and the teaching assistant will *not* read drafts of the research paper.
- The submitted research paper must be typed, double-spaced, and printed in a 12 pt. font and with at least 1 inch margins. Nothing beyond 15 pp. will be read.
- The research paper is due in the Political Science Department office (1414 Social Sciences) no later than 12 p.m. on Fri., Dec. 17. A failure to submit the research paper by the due date will result in the deduction of 1/3 of a letter grade per day.

• *****Graduate Students*****—Requirements for **POL 5885**

- (a) two (2) 5 pp. papers
 - Instructions identical to (a), under Track 1.
- (b) one (1) 3 pp. paper reacting to *The Battle of Algiers*
 - Instructions identical to (b), under Track 1.
- (c) 20-25 pp. research paper
 - Except for length, instructions identical to (d), under Track 2.

N.B.: Graduate student writing will be held to a standard higher than that expected of the undergraduates.

GRADING

• Track 1 (3 credits)

Short Paper 1:	20%
Short Paper 2:	20%
Reaction Piece:	10%
Final Exam:	50%

• Track 2 (4 credits)

Short Paper:	20%
Reaction Piece:	10%
Final Exam:	30%
Research Paper:	40%

{Prospectus: 20% of final research paper grade}

• POL 5885

Short Paper 1:	15%
Short Paper 2:	15%
Reaction Piece:	10%
Research Paper:	60%

{Prospectus: 20% of final research paper grade}

NB: In all tracks, the instructor reserves the right to reward students whose class participation is extraordinary and to punish students whose class participation is below the bar (e.g. those who, when called upon to present the argument in one of their short papers, demonstrate that they have not prepared adequately). Class participation will matter, however, only when students are at the margins, hovering between two letter grades.

READINGS

The following books are **required**. They have been ordered for purchase at the University bookstore in the Coffman Memorial Union and have all been placed on reserve at Wilson Library.

- Robert J. Art and Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Use of Force*, 6th ed. (Rowman and Littlefield, 2003).
- Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones, and Steven E. Miller, eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace* (MIT Press, 1996).
- James Joll, *The Origins of the First World War*, 2nd ed. (Longman 1992 [1984]).
- Robert I. Rotberg and Theodore K. Rabb, eds., *The Origin and Prevention of Major Wars* (Cambridge UP, 1988).
- Thomas Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (Yale UP, 1966).

All other readings can be found **on-line**, through the **course web-site**. The course web-site has been created using the WebCT Vista system and can be accessed by logging in at **vista.umn.edu**.

OTHER

Students are expected to be familiar with the University of Minnesota's codes of student conduct and scholastic misconduct.

Students are strongly encouraged to take advantage of office hours. Office hours are an excellent opportunity to discuss issues and questions not addressed in sufficient detail in class.

Students are strongly encouraged to discuss their work with others, form study-groups, and read and edit each other's papers. However, the end product must be one's own! Violations of this rule will result in a failing grade.

If you have special learning needs or require accommodation for family commitments, medical emergencies, etc., please let the instructor know as soon as possible.

CLASS SCHEDULE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

- Sept. 7 *Lecture:* Introduction
- the organization of the course
 - mundane details (assignments, readings)

Lecture: What is security? What is strategy? How (and why) do states use force?

I. The Causes of War and Peace

- Sept. 14, 21 *Lecture:*

N.B.: These topics are so interconnected that I have listed the two weeks of reading and lecture together.
9/14: • read theory (I and II)
9/21: • review theory; come to class with questions of clarification, critique, etc.
• read about WW I: what insights do the theoretical approaches yield for understanding the origins of the Great War?

I. Anarchy and the Distribution of Power (Polarity)

1. Structural Realist Approaches

- Robert Art, "The Fungibility of Force," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 3-22.
- Robert Gilpin, "The Theory of Hegemonic War," in Rotberg and Rabb, eds., *Origin and Prevention*, pp. 15-38.
- Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," in Rotberg and Rabb, eds., *Origin and Prevention*, pp. 39-52.

2. Questioning Anarchy and Polarity

- Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make Of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46:2 (spring 1992) pp. 391-425.
- R. Harrison Wagner, "What was Bipolarity?" *International Organization* 47:1 (winter 1993) pp. 77-106.

II. Strategy, the Security Dilemma, and the Offense-Defense Balance

- Stephen Van Evera, "Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 44-69.

Case: World War I

- Joll, *Origins of the First World War*, chapters 1-4 (pp. 1-108).
- Jack Snyder, "The Cult of the Offensive in 1914," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 121-137.

Recommended

- Samuel Williamson, "The Origins of World War I," in Rotberg and Rabb, eds., *Origin and Prevention of Major Wars*, pp. 225-248.
- Charles S. Maier, "Wargames: 1914-1919," in Rotberg and Rabb, eds., *Origin and Prevention of Major Wars*, pp. 249-280.

Sept. 28

Lecture: Domestic Politics and Culture

- Jack S. Levy, "Domestic Politics and War," in Rotberg and Rabb, *Origin and Prevention*, pp. 79-100.

Case: World War I

- Joll, *Origins of the First World War*, chapter 5, 6, 8 (pp. 109-173, 199-233).

Oct. 5

Lecture and Discussion: The Liberal-Democratic Peace (and War)

- Brown et al., eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace*:
 - Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs," pp. 3-30.
 - Russett, "The Fact of Democratic Peace," pp. 58-81.
 - Russett, "Why Democratic Peace?" pp. 82-115.
 - Owen, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace," pp. 116-133, 148-154.
 - Layne, "Kant or Cant," pp. 157-167, 190-201.
 - Oren, "The Subjectivity of the Democratic Peace," pp. 263-273, 294-300.
 - Doyle, "Michael Doyle on the Democratic Peace—Again," pp. 364-373.

Lecture: War and the Individual

- Robert Jervis, "War and Misperception," in Rotberg and Rabb, *Origin and Prevention*, pp. 101-126.

Case: World War I (28 pp.)

- Richard Ned Lebow, "The July Crisis: A Case Study," in his *Between Peace and War* (Johns Hopkins UP, 1981) pp. 119-147.

Discussion: Was World War I inevitable?

Oct. 12

Lecture: Handling American Hegemony

- *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September 2002.

Unipolarity: A Passing Moment or an Enduring Era?

- Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "American Primacy in Perspective," *Foreign Affairs* 81:4 (July/August 2002) pp. 20-33.
- Robert Pape, "The World Pushes Back," *Boston Globe*, 23 March 2003.

Unilateralism, Multilateralism, and the Debate over Empire

- Robert Kagan and William Kristol, "The Present Danger," *National Interest* (spring 2000) pp. 57-69.
- Niall Ferguson, "A World Without Power," *Foreign Policy* (July/August 2004).
- Fareed Zakaria, "The Arrogant Empire," *Newsweek*, 24 March 2003.
- G. John Ikenberry, "The End of the Neo-Conservative Moment," *Survival* (spring 2004) pp. 7-22.
- Francis Fukuyama, "The Neoconservative Moment," *National Interest* (summer 2004) pp. 57-68.
- Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq," *Foreign Affairs* 82:4 (July/August 2003) pp. 60-73.
- Shashi Tharoor, "Why America Still Needs the United Nations," *Foreign Affairs* 82:5 (September/October 2003) pp. 67-80.

The End of the West? Clash of Civilizations, Clash Within Civilizations

- Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History?” *National Interest* (summer 1989) pp. 3-18.
- Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations,” *Foreign Affairs* 72:3 (summer 1993) pp. 22-49.
- Stephen Walt, “The Imbalance of Power: On the Prospects for Effective American-European Relations,” *Harvard Magazine* (March/April 2004) pp. 32-35.
- Robert Kagan, “America’s Crisis of Legitimacy,” *Foreign Affairs* 83:2 (March/April 2004) pp. 65-87.
- James W. Ceaser, “A Genealogy of Anti-Americanism,” *The Public Interest* (Summer 2003) pp. 3-18.
- Parag Khanna, “The Metrosexual Superpower,” *Foreign Policy* (July/August 2004).

Debate—Three Central Questions

1. Will others balance against the United States? Will American hegemony endure?
2. Has Sept. 11 proved the clash of civilizations thesis? What remains of “the West”?
3. Should the United States work through multilateral institutions (such as the United Nations) at all costs? Should it pursue a unilateral foreign policy when its interests so demand?

II. Limited Uses of Force

Oct. 19 *Lecture: The Theory and Practice of Coercion*

****DUE IN CLASS: RESEARCH PAPER PROSPECTUS****

- Robert J. Art, “To What Ends Military Power?” *International Security* 4:4 (spring 1980) pp. 3-14.
- Schelling, *Arms and Influence*, pp. 1-125.

Recommended:

If you have difficulty comprehending or extracting the main points from the Schelling reading, consult Daniel Byman and Matthew Waxman, *The Dynamics of Coercion: American Foreign Policy and the Limits of Military Might* (Cambridge UP, 2002) pp. 1-47, for a clear exposition of many central concepts.

Debate: Can the United States deter China from attacking Taiwan?

- Taiwan Relations Act (1979), Sections 2-3.
- “The Taiwan Question and the Reunification of China,” People’s Republic of China, Aug. 1993 (excerpts).
- Richard K. Betts and Thomas J. Christensen, “China: Getting the Questions Right,” *National Interest* (winter 2000/2001) pp. 17-29.
- Robert S. Ross, “The Stability of Deterrence in the Taiwan Strait,” *National Interest* (fall 2001) pp. 67-76.
- Thomas J. Christensen, “Posing Problems without Catching Up: China’s Rise and Challenges for U.S. Security Policy,” *International Security* 25:4 (spring 2001) pp. 14-38.

Debate: Could/should the United States (and its allies) have relied on deterrence to avoid Gulf War II?

- John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "An Unnecessary War," *Foreign Policy* (January/February 2003) pp. 50-59.
- Kenneth M. Pollack, "Why Iraq Can't Be Deterred," *New York Times*, 26 September 2002.

Oct. 26

Lecture: Nuclear Deterrence

- Robert Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution: Statecraft and the Prospect of Armageddon* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989) pp. 1-45.

Discussion: Explaining the "Long Peace" of the Cold War

- John Mueller, "The Essential Irrelevance of Nuclear Weapons: Stability in the Postwar World," *International Security* 13:2 (fall 1988) pp. 55-79.
- Robert Jervis, "The Utility of Nuclear Deterrence," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 94-101.
- David A. Welch et al., "The Cuban Missile Crisis," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 197-220.

Recommended

- Kenneth Waltz, "Nuclear Myths and Political Realities," Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 102-117.
- McGeorge Bundy, "The Unimpressive Record of Atomic Diplomacy," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 85-93.

Debate: Nuclear Proliferation

- Scott D. Sagan, "Nuclear Instability in South Asia," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 370-381.
- Kenneth N. Waltz, "Nuclear Stability in South Asia," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 382-393.
- "Can North Korea Be Engaged? An Exchange Between Victor D. Cha and David C. Kang," *Survival* 46:2 (summer 2004) pp. 89-108.

Recommended

- Scott D. Sagan and Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed*, 2nd ed. (Norton, 2003).
- Scott D. Sagan, "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb," *International Security* 21 (winter 1996/97) pp. 54-86.
- Barry Posen, "What if Iraq Had Nuclear Weapons?" in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 353-369.

Nov. 2

Lecture: The Limits of Coercion: Critiques and Alternatives

- Robert J. Art, "Coercive Diplomacy: What Do We Know?" in Robert Art and Patrick M. Cronin, eds., *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy* (USIP Press, 2003) pp. 359-374, 387-410.
- Janice Gross Stein, "Reassurance in International Conflict Management," *Political Science Quarterly* 106:3 (autumn 1991) pp. 431-451.

Debate: Airpower and Kosovo, 1999

- Robert A. Pape, "The True Worth of Air Power," *Foreign Affairs* 83:2 (March/April 2004) pp. 116-130.
- Merrill A. McPeak and Robert A. Pape, "Hit or Miss," *Foreign Affairs* 83:5 (September/October 2004) pp. 160-163.
- William M. Arkin, "Operation Allied Force: 'The Most Precise Application of Air Power in History,'" in Andrew J. Bacevich and Eliot A. Cohen, eds., *War Over Kosovo: Politics and Strategy in a Global Age* (Columbia UP, 2001) pp. 1-29.
- Andrew L. Stigler, "A Clear Victory for Air Power: NATO's Empty Threat to Invade Kosovo," *International Security* 27:3 (winter 2002/03) pp. 124-157.

Nov. 9

Lecture: Communal Conflict and Military Intervention

- Michael E. Brown, "The Causes of Internal Conflict," in Brown et al., eds., *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996/97) pp. 3-25.
- Chaim Kaufmann, "Intervention in Ethnic and Ideological Civil Wars," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 394-414.
- Barbara Walter, "The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement," in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 436-449.
- Richard K. Betts, "The Delusion of Impartial Intervention," *Foreign Affairs* 73:6 (November/ December 1994) pp. 20-33.
- Gideon Rose, "The Exit Strategy Delusion," *Foreign Affairs* 77 (January-February 1998) pp. 56-67.

Debate: When and How to Intervene

- Shashi Tharoor and Sam Daws, "Humanitarian Intervention: Getting Past the Reefs," *World Policy Journal* (summer 2001) pp. 21-30.
- Walter Clarke and Jeffrey Herbst, "Somalia and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention," *Foreign Affairs* 75:2 (March/April 1996) pp. 70-85.
- Samantha Power, "Bystanders to Genocide," *Atlantic Monthly* (September 2001).
- Alan J. Kuperman, "Rwanda in Retrospect," *Foreign Affairs* 79:1 (January/February 2000) pp. 94-118.
- Samantha Power, "Dying in Darfur," *New Yorker*, 30 August 2004.

Nov. 16

Lecture: Occupation and Counterinsurgency

- Douglas Porch, "Occupational Hazards," *National Interest* (summer 2003) pp. 35-47.
- David M. Edelstein, "Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail," *International Security* 29: 1 (summer 2004) pp. 49-91.
- D. Michael Shafer, "The Unlearned Lessons of Counterinsurgency," *Political Science Quarterly* 103:1 (spring 1988) pp. 57-80.

Discussion: Iraq 2003-2004

- James Fallows, "Blind Into Baghdad," *Atlantic Monthly* (January/February 2004).
- Larry Diamond, "What Went Wrong in Iraq?" *Foreign Affairs* 83:5 (September/October 2004) pp. 34-56.
- Bruce Hoffman, *Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in Iraq*, RAND Corp. Occasional Paper, June 2004. (18 pp.)

Yes, academics do lack imagination. You would think that two articles published a year apart would have *different* titles.

- Wesley K. Clark, “Key to Success,” *New Republic*, 7-14 June 2004.
- Eric Posner, “Bring Back the Baathists,” *New York Times*, 28 April 2004.
- Reuel Marc Gerecht, “What is to be Done in Iraq?” *Weekly Standard*, 3 May 2004.
- Edward Luttwak, “Time To Quit Iraq (Sort Of),” *New York Times*, 18 August 2004.

Nov. 23 *Movie and Discussion: The Battle of Algiers (1967)*

A classic movie about the Algerian revolt against their French colonial masters and the brutal French counterinsurgency campaign. How to win the battles but lose the war.

- Martin Stone, *The Agony of Algeria* (Columbia UP, 1997) chapter 1, “Algeria Before 1962,” pp. 25-42.
- Martha Crenshaw, “The Effectiveness of Terrorism in the Algerian War,” in Crenshaw, ed., *Terrorism in Context* (Pennsylvania State UP, 1995) pp. 473-513.

Nov. 30 *Lecture: Terrorism—What, Who, Why*

****DUE IN CLASS: 5 PP. REACTION PIECE ON THE BATTLE OF ALGIERS****

- Brian M. Jenkins, “International Terrorism,” in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 77-84.
- Walter Laqueur, “The Changing Face of Terror,” in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 450-457.
- Nicholas Lemann, “What Terrorists Want,” *New Yorker*, 29 October 2001.
- Alan Krueger and Jitka Maleckova, “Does Poverty Cause Terrorism?” *New Republic*, 24 June 2002, pp. 27-32.
- Audrey Kurth Cronin, “Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism,” *International Security* 27:3 (winter 2002/03) pp. 30-58.
- “The Foundation of the New Terrorism,” *The 9/11 Commission Report*, chapter 2.

Debate: How to Respond...

- Richard A. Falkenrath et al., “America’s Achilles’ Heel: Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Terrorism and Covert Attack,” in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 463-468.
- Brahma Chellaney, “Lessons from Fighting Terrorism in South Asia,” in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 458-462.
- Paul A. Pillar, “Dealing with Terrorists,” in Art and Waltz, eds., *Use of Force*, pp. 469-476.
- “What To Do? A Global Strategy,” *The 9/11 Commission Report*, chapter 12.

Dec. 7 *Lecture: Alternatives to Force—Economic Statecraft*

- Robert Pape, “Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work,” *International Security* 22:2 (fall 1997) pp. 90-137.
- David Baldwin, “The Sanctions Debate and the Logic of Choice,” *International Security* 24:3 (winter 1999/2000) pp. 80-107.

Case: The Sanctions on Iraq, 1991-2003

- Kenneth M. Pollack, *The Threatening Storm: The Case for Invading Iraq* (Random House, 2002) pp. 211-242.
- David Rieff, "Were Sanctions Right?" *New York Times Magazine*, 27 July 2003 pp. 41-46.

Lecture: Intelligence

- Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Peering Into the Future," *Foreign Affairs* 73:4 (July/August 1994) pp. 82-93.

Case: 9/11

- *The 9/11 Commission Report*:
 - "From Threat to Threat," chap. 6.
 - "The System Was Blinking Red," chap. 8.
 - "Foresight – and Hindsight," chap. 11.
 - Skim "How To Do It? A Different Way of Organizing the Government," chap. 13.

III. Looking Ahead

Dec. 14 *Lecture: The Future—Sources of Stability and Instability: Five Key Debates*

Debate 1: Conflict in the Developed World

- John J. Mearsheimer, "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War," *Atlantic Monthly* (August 1990) pp. 35-50.
- Robert Jervis, "Theories of War in an Era of Leading-Power Peace," *American Political Science Review* 96:1 (March 2002) pp. 1-14.
- review debate on transatlantic relations (in session on US hegemony)

Debate 2: Conflict in the Developing World

- Robert D. Kaplan, "The Coming Anarchy," *Atlantic Monthly* (February 1994) pp. 44-76.
- Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," *Foreign Affairs* 74:3 (May/June 1995) pp. 79-97.

Debate 3: End of History or Clash of Civilizations? (earlier in syllabus)

Debate 4: The Implications of China's Rise (earlier in syllabus)

Debate 5: Future War: Antiseptic Fighting?

- Eliot Cohen, "A Revolution in Warfare," *Foreign Affairs* 75:2 (March/April 1996) pp. 37-54.
- Stephen Biddle, "Afghanistan and the Future of Warfare," *Foreign Affairs* 82:2 (March/April 2003) pp. 31-46.