**Political Science 365 Contemporary International Politics**

**Spring, 2017 Professor Volgy**

**Tuesdays/Thursdays, 9:30-10:45 Chavez 104**

**Syllabus**

**Office Hours**: Thursdays, 2-3:30; Fridays 11-12:30 and by appointment.

**Office**: Social Sciences 330

**E-mail**: volgy@email.arizona.edu

**Web page**: <http://www.u.arizona.edu/~volgy>

**GOALS:**

Although the title of this course indicates that this class is about contemporary international politics, that title should not lead you to think that the course is only about today’s current events. While current events will be used to illustrate the general trends in the course, the major goal here is to develop our abilities ***to think critically*** about international politics through an examination of a number of important, **general principles** regarding how international politics work, and with which we can understand *both* “contemporary”, past, and future events and phenomena.

**APPROACHES TO THIS COURSE:**

There are two general approaches used for understanding the contents of this course. One is traditional: trying to focus on the subject by virtue of the common readings, class discussions and class lectures (occasional). The second approach will have us utilize these materials in a more concrete way by applying them to more specific situations. This second approach is based on a **role playing** method and it will involve the following steps:

* Each student is asked to choose a specific “group” and a “role” to play within the group. On the basis of these choices, students will be placed into groups (usually countries) and into specific roles within these groups.
* Each group in the class will be asked to do some research on the group, and to present the research in writing. This occurs in two phases, as is noted below.
* Groups will be asked to play out their roles. As we move through the course, and each group develops expertise about itself, members of the group will be called upon in class to blend their expertise with the generalizations we are discussing during a particular week. For example, when we discuss nationalism, we may ask the French group to respond to the question of how French nationalism affects French foreign policy.
* The course will conclude with a discussion of some ***global governance issues*** when each group will be asked to specifically provide input on the positions they take on these issues and the justification for doing so, based on the principles we have discussed throughout the course.

**GRADES:**

Grades will be based on the following:

***Exams*:** there will be a midterm and a final exam. Together they will be worth 50% of the course grade;

***Role playing involvement****:* the combination of your research, written presentation, and role performance will be worth 40% of the course grade;

***Class participation****:* the quality of your class participation will be worth 10% of the course grade. In order to assist you with your class participation, the weekly course focus on the syllabus includes a number of questions to think about in the context of the readings. *You should think about those questions before coming to class and be ready to discuss your answers to those questions in class.* **Class attendance is mandatory: if you don’t think you can come to class every time it meets, then you should not be taking this course!**

**EXPECTATIONS:**

***Examination policy:***There will be two exams in the course and their times and dates are listed in the syllabus. Therefore, it is assumed that you will plan your schedule accordingly, and will take these exams when they are scheduled. If you cannot, for any reason, attend the midterm or the final, you must notify me at least one week **prior** to the exam. I will not give make-up exams unless your inability to take the exam involved an extremely unusual hardship or unavoidable circumstance.

***Attendance policy:*** I consider discussion in this class, and the occasional lectures you will hear to be a crucial component of this course. Furthermore, the parts of the class focusing on role playing are essential to your grade. Just as important, this course meets only twice a week; this means that missing one class means missing a substantial amount of the content of this course. Missing class will mean that it will be virtually impossible for you to do well in the course. It is assumed that you will come to every class. There will be an attendance list circulating during each class session.

 ***Role playing:*** Every person in this course will be assigned a role, and will be part of a group. Both the preparation for, and the role playing itself will require you to work with others in collaboration. That is also how international politics work and foreign policies are developed and conducted. Sometimes, however, this leads some students to think that they can slack off and let the other members of the group take up the extra work. ***Warning: it won’t work.*** You will be doing a tremendous disservice to yourself, and to other members of the group, and ultimately, it will be reflected in your grade. In this class you will have to work with others; learn to depend on others; and allow them to depend on you as well.

***Withdrawal policy****:* Technically, the university allows students a number of weeks before they can no longer withdraw from a course. Unfortunately, in this class it is a luxury that we do not have. Since you will be working with a group, withdrawal at a later date will cause no amount of grief for the rest of your group. Therefore, I will not allow withdrawals from the course after January 19th, unless there is a very unusual circumstance.

***Plagiarism***: There is nothing worse at a university than the theft of one’s work. Plagiarism comes in many forms, including paying for a paper one didn’t write, copying someone else’s work, failing to appropriately cite the work or ideas of another. All of these actions are punished strongly, including failing the course, and the possibility of expulsion from the University. Given these risks, (irrespective of the ethical issues involved), and the likelihood that one will get caught, it doesn’t make sense to plagiarize. The University’s plagiarism policy is located at: <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/academic-integrity/students/academic-integrity>. Assistance with what is and what is not plagiarism is provided at: <http://www.library.arizona.edu/help/tutorials/plagiarism/>

***Other issues***: I hope I don’t need to remind you of this, but just in case, it is expected that we treat each other with respect and dignity. University policies regarding these issues can be found at: <http://policy.arizona.edu/human-resources/nondiscrimination-and-anti-harassment-policy> and at: <http://policy.arizona.edu/education-and-student-affairs/threatening-behavior-students> . Additionally, respect for all of us includes not coming to class late and interrupting others; turning off cell phones before arriving to class, ***not using laptops during class session for anything unrelated specifically to the materials being addressed that day in class***, etc.

You will see that often I will use power points and a power point projector. I do this only because I have terrible handwriting and it is hard to read. So, it is a short-hand for what we are discussing. **WARNING**: there is nothing more dangerous than power points for learning…they are just an outline of ideas or a shorthand for ideas, not the ideas themselves. So, please be careful with them, and take notes on the ideas behind the outline. This is also why I don’t put the power points on my web page and please don’t ask for a copy of them

 On another note: if you need assistance or looking for support with special needs, they can be located at either the S.A.L.T center (<http://www.salt.arizona.edu/>) or at the Disability Resources center (<http://drc.arizona.edu/>). **It is the University’s goal that learning experiences be as accessible as possible.  If you anticipate or experience physical or academic barriers based on disability or pregnancy, please let me know immediately so that we can discuss options.  You are also welcome to contact Disability Resources (520-621-3268) to establish reasonable accommodations. Please be aware that the accessible table and chairs in this room should remain available for students who find that standard classroom seating is not usable.**

**FINALLY: *Please keep in mind that the syllabus acts as a contract between the faculty member and the student. By taking this course, you agree to read the requirements noted in the syllabus and agree to abide by them. By passing out the syllabus, likewise I agree to its terms with you. Changes to the syllabus then should only occur through mutual consent, and both instructor and student agree to act accordingly.***

**Calendar of Readings and Assignments**

**Reading Materials:**

Williams, Goldstein, and Shafritz, ***Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates In International Relations*** (Third Edition). Note: in addition, there are required readings, placed on my web page. These readings are indicated by ® next to the reading assignment and they can be found under the course section, for Pol 365 on my web page (along with this syllabus) at: <http://www.u.arizona.edu/~volgy/courses.html> .You can click on the sub-page called “required readings” and the required reading and the assignment should appear in alphabetical order. Additionally, there are some other materials of value for you. Links to useful Internet sources are contained in the appendix of this syllabus.

I strongly suggest as well (but will not require) that you get a subscription to the *New York Times* (alternatively, you can access it electronically at [www.nytimes.com)](http://www.nytimes.com)), for free.

 ***Note that for each week’s assignment, there are one or more questions for you to think about as you read the assigned readings and think about the topic. Please be prepared to discuss these questions in class. Also, note that most weeks contain two subjects and two sets of readings and questions.***

**DATE TOPIC and READINGS**

**Week 1**

(January 12) **Introduction to course: objectives and requirements**

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 2**

(January 17) **Introduction to approaches, nature of international politics**

**Questions**: 1) What’s the security dilemma?

 2) What does Waltz mean by anarchy?

 3) What is Wendt’s answer?

**READINGS:** Williams,Chapters 24 (Waltz); 26 (Herz); 35 (Wendt).

-------------------------------------------------------

(January 19) **Methods of Control: Some Vital Concepts**

**Questions:** 1) What is power (see appendix 1A through 1C)?

 2) Which is the most powerful nation today? The second most powerful?

 3) Which is the least powerful nation today?

**READINGS:** Walt, 2005. “Taming American Power.” *Foreign Affairs*®

Williams, Chapter 65 (Nye); Chapter 28 (Morgenthau)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 3**

(January 24 **NO CLASSES THIS WEEK…I’m in Saudi Arabia**

January 26)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 4**

(January 31) **The Impact of Domestic Factors on International Politics**

**Questions**: 1) See the scenario and question in appendix 2.

 2) How much does it matter for Russian foreign policy if Medvedev governs instead of Putin? Would you say the same about the change in leadership in the United Kingdom from the Labour government to the Tory coalition?

**READINGS**: Thompson 2006 “China’s Leadership Gap.” *Foreign Affairs* ®

 Dyson, Raleigh 2014 “Public and Private Beliefs of Political Leaders,” *Research and Politics* ®

---------------------------------------------

(February 1) **Formulating Foreign Policy: How Decisions Are Made**

**Questions:** 1) What did the U.S. decide to do about the Cuban Missile Crisis? Why?

 2) If G. W. Bush or Barak Obama had been president in 1962, would either one have made the same decision?

**REDINGS:** Williams, Chapter 20 (Allison)

Drezner, (2011) “Does Obama Have a Grand Strategy?” *Foreign Affairs* ®

Baker, (2009) “How Obama Came to Plan for Surge in Afghanistan” ®

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 5**

February 7) **Formulating Foreign Policy (continued)**

---------------------------------------------

(February 9) **Defense Policy: A Special Case of Decision Making**

**Questions:** 1) Do nuclear weapons make the world more dangerous? Why?

 2) How would you go about making sure that your opponent doesn’t use nuclear weapons?

**READINGS**: Williams, Chapter 40 (Brodie), 41 (Wohlstetter), 43(Schelling)

 van den Heuvel. 2015. “The New Nuclear Arms Race” ®

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 6**

(February 14) **Defense Policy (continued)**

**READINGS:** Williams, Chapter 42 (Dror)

 Bracken, 2003. “The Second Nuclear Age.” ®

---------------------------------------------

 (February 16) **Ideology and Nationalism**

**Questions:** 1) Can you distinguish between ideology and nationalism, giving an example of each? What makes them so different?

**READINGS**: Williams, Chapter 52 (Huntington); Chapter 53 (Kaplan)

Beinart (2015) “Ideological Differences Over Terrorism” *The Atlantic.*

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 7**

(February 21) NO CLASSES: I’m presenting research at the International Studies Association Conference in Baltimore

February 23)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 8**

(February 28) **A World of Penetrated States: Non State Actors and Terrorism in International Politics.**

**Questions:** 1) Is international terrorism a problem for your group? Why?

2) Is there an effective way you can address this issue? (The US State Department

 web site for terrorism can be accessed at: <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/> ; there is also the Global Terrorism Database at: http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/off/)

**READINGS:** Williams, Chapter 55 (Hoffman), Chapter 58 (Homer-Dixon)

 Riedel, 2007. “Al Qaeda Strikes Back.” *Foreign Affairs* ®

 Lal, 2005.“ South Asian Organized Crime and Terrorist Networks,” ®

 Markoff et al., 2010. “Cyberwar” *New York Time*s, ®

 Zetter, 2012. “Meet Flame…The Massive Spy Malware…” New York Times ®

---------------------------------------------

(March 2) **Discussion of Midterm Exam**

**FIRST GROUP WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT DUE TODAY**

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**Week 9**

(March 7) **MIDTERM EXAM**

**-------------------------------------------**

(March 9) **Debriefing the Midterm Exam**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 10**

(March 14) **NO CLASSES…Spring Break**

March 16)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 11**

(March 21) **International Organizations: Actors, Structures, Tools** (the UN web page can be found at: <http://www.un.org/>).

**Questions:** 1) What’s wrong with the UN? What’s right with the UN?

 2) Did the UN fail in Bosnia? in Iraq? in Sudan? Why?

**READINGS**: Williams, Chapter 51 (Rosenau), Chapter 22 (optional)

Bird, 2001. “The IMF and Developing Countries,” in P.F. Diehl, *The Politics of Global Governance* (2001) ®

 (optional) The Commission on Global Governance, “Reforming the United Nations,”®

----------------------------------------

(March 23) **International Organizations (continued)**

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 12**

(March 28) **International Law as a Structure for Action** (for an example, click on the International Criminal Tribunal on Yugoslavia at <http://www.un.org/icty/>)

**Questions:** 1)What is law? Using your definition, is there such a thing as international law? How do you know?

**READINGS:** Ratner, 1998. “International Law: The Trial of Global Norms.” *Foreign Policy*®

 Williams, Chapter 31 (Coplin)

------------------------------------------------

(March 30) NO CLASS…I’m In Taiwan

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 13**

(April 4) NO CLASS…I’m trying to get back from Taiwan

--------------------------------

(April 6) **Alliances as Structures and Constraints/Global Architectures**

**Questions:** 1) What is meant by bipolarity? What is meant by multipolarity?

2) What’s a hegemon? How do you know when you see one?

 3) What is the major disagreement between Kagan and Maynes? Why? On what major issue do they agree?

**READINGS:**  Williams, Chapter 13 (Waltz), Chapter 14 (Deutsch), Chapter 15 (Kaplan)

 Kagan, 1998. “The Benevolent Empire” *Foreign Policy* ®

 Maynes, 1998. “The Perils of (and for) an Imperial America,” *Foreign Policy* (98) ®

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 14**

(April 11) **Alliances as Structures and Constraints/Global Architectures (continued).**

---------------------------------------------------

 (April 13) **Global versus Regional Politics: Major Powers and Regional Powers\***

**Questions:** 1) What’s a major global power? What’s a regional power? How do you know?

 2) Is your group either one of those?

 3) Are global and regional powers getting weaker or stronger in world politics?

**READINGS:** Wohlforth, “Unipolarity, Status Competition and Great Power War,” World Politics, 2009 ®

 Jentleson and Weber, “America’s Hard Sell,” Foreign Policy, 2008 ®

 Williams, Chapter 63 (Brooks)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 15**

(April 18) **Crisis Behavior.**

**Questions:** 1)Have you ever had a crisis in your life? Why did you think of it as a “crisis”? What’s a crisis?

**READINGS:** Holsti, “Theories of Crisis Decision-making,”®

--------------------------------------------------

 (April 20) **Negotiations and Bargaining.**

**Questions:** 1) How appropriate is the analogy of poker for the process of bargaining? Where does it fit, and where doesn’t it?

 2) Look carefully at the Sicherman piece on “Next Steps…” Who are the key players bargaining in the Middle East? Who has most to lose? Least?

**READINGS:** Morgenstern, “Cold War as Cold Poker,” ®

 Sicherman, “Next Steps in the Middle East”®

**NOTE: second part of written group assignment due today**

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 16**

**ATTENTION: Role playing scenario unfolds here**

 (April 25) **Global Governance Issues: How to Govern the World**

**Questions:** 1) Who makes global public policy?

 2) Over what issue areas does it get done well and in what issue areas does it get done badly, and more importantly, why?

**READINGS:** Williams and Bellamy “Principles, Politics and Prudence: Libya and the Responsibility to Protect,” *Global Governance* (2012) ®

 Nishihata, “Global Governance and the Spread of Cyberspace Controls,” *Global Governance* (2012)

---------------------

(April 27) **(Role playing scenario continues)**

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 17**

(May 2) **Wrap Up and Discussion of Final Exam**

**NOTE: Your individual and group evaluations (Appendix 6 and Appendix 7) due today**

**-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Final Exam: May 9th, 8:00 AM to 10:00AM**

**APPENDIX 1A POWER RANKINGS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RANK** | **Military Spending** | **Armed Forces** | **Strongest Armies** | **GNP** | **GNP per capita****(wealth)** | **Top Exporters** | **Top Importers** |
| **1** | United States | China | US | United States | Luxembourg | China | U.S. |
| **2** | China | United States | Russia | China | Switzerland | US | China |
| **3** | *Saudi Arabia* | *India* | China | Japan | Qatar | Germany | Germany |
| **4** | Russia | N. Korean | India | Germany | Norway | Japan | Japan |
| **5** | United Kingdom | Russia | UK | UK | US | South Korea | UK |
| **6** | France | Turkey  | France | France | Iceland | France | France |
| **7** | Japan | S. Korea | *Germany* | *Brazil* | Singapore | *Netherlands* | *S. Korea* |
| **8** | *India* | Pakistan | S. Korea | Italy | Denmark | Russia | India |
| **9** | Germany | Iran | *Italy* | *India* | Australia | UK | Netherlands |
| **10** | S. Korea | Egypt | Brazil | Russia | Sweden | Italy | Canada |

**Appendix 1B:** WHO CAN MAKE FISSILE MATERIAL TODAY/ ENRICHMENT AND REPROCESSING FACILITIES WORLDWIDE (Source: UN NPT Review Conference, May 2015)



Nuclear Weapons Programs Worldwide

|  |
| --- |
| http://isis-online.org/assets/images/worldmap.gif**Key** |
| http://isis-online.org/assets/images/red_box.gif | [Nuclear weapons programs that began before 1970 when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) came into force, succeeded, and are still ongoing](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/p5) |
| http://isis-online.org/assets/images/yellow_box.gif | [Programs that essentially ended by the time NPT started](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/endedbynpt) |
| http://isis-online.org/assets/images/darkblue_box.gif | [Factions within advocated for or sought nuclear weapons, but these ambitions ended by the time NPT started](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/factions)  |
| http://isis-online.org/assets/images/darkgreen_box.gif | [Programs that ended after 1970](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/endedpost1970) |
| Programs that started after 1970 and:       http://isis-online.org/assets/images/gray_box.gif [Succeeded and are ongoing](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/startedpost1970)      http://isis-online.org/assets/images/purple_box.gif [Are suspected to be actively seeking nuclear weapons](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/startedpost1970)       http://isis-online.org/assets/images/orange_box.gif [Are now ended](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/startedpost1970)  |
| http://isis-online.org/assets/images/lightgreen_box.gif | [Intentions suspected but no nuclear weapons program identified](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/intentions) |
|   |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| http://isis-online.org/assets/images/lightblue_box.gif | [Inherited nuclear weapons, but now a non-nuclear weapon state party to the NPT](http://isis-online.org/nuclear-weapons-programs/inherited) |

 |

**Appendix 1C: American Power Moves Beyond the Mere Superpower (The New York Times, Week in Review, April 27, 2003)**

**By GREGG EASTERBROOK**

Stealth drones, G.P.S.-guided smart munitions that hit precisely where aimed; antitank bombs that guide themselves; space-relayed data links that allow individual squad leaders to know exactly where American and opposition forces are during battle — the United States military rolled out all this advanced technology, and more, in its lightning conquest of Iraq. No other military is even close to the United States. The American military is now the strongest the world has ever known, both in absolute terms and relative to other nations; stronger than the Wehrmacht in 1940, stronger than the legions at the height of Roman power. For years to come, no other nation is likely even to try to rival American might.

Which means: the global arms race is over, with the United States the undisputed heavyweight champion. Other nations are not even trying to match American armed force, because they are so far behind they have no chance of catching up. The great-powers arms race, in progress for centuries, has ended with the rest of the world conceding triumph to the United States.

Now only a nuclear state, like, perhaps, North Korea, has any military leverage against the winner. Paradoxically, the runaway American victory in the conventional arms race might inspire a new round of proliferation of atomic weapons. With no hope of matching the United States plane for plane, more countries may seek atomic weapons to gain deterrence.

North Korea might have been moved last week to declare that it has an atomic bomb by the knowledge that it has no hope of resisting American conventional power. If it becomes generally believed that possession of even a few nuclear munitions is enough to render North Korea immune from American military force, other nations — Iran is an obvious next candidate — may place renewed emphasis on building them.

For the extent of American military superiority has become almost impossible to overstate. The United States sent five of its nine supercarrier battle groups to the region for the Iraq assault. A tenth Nimitz-class supercarrier is under construction. No other nation possesses so much as one supercarrier, let alone nine battle groups ringed by cruisers and guarded by nuclear submarines.

Russia has one modern aircraft carrier, the Admiral Kuznetsov, but it has about half the tonnage of an American supercarrier, and has such a poor record that it rarely leaves port. The former Soviet navy did preliminary work on a supercarrier, but abandoned the project in 1992. Britain and France have a few small aircraft carriers. China decided against building one last year.

Any attempt to build a fleet that threatens the Pentagon's would be pointless, after all, because if another nation fielded a threatening vessel, American attack submarines would simply sink it in the first five minutes of any conflict. (The new Seawolf-class nuclear-powered submarine is essentially the futuristic supersub of "The Hunt for Red October" made real.) Knowing this, all other nations have conceded the seas to the United States, a reason American forces can sail anywhere without interference. The naval arms race — a principal aspect of great-power politics for centuries — is over.

United States air power is undisputed as well, with more advanced fighters and bombers than those of all other nations combined. The United States possesses three stealth aircraft (the B-1 and B-2 bombers and the F-117 fighter) with two more (the F-22 and F-35 fighters) developed and awaiting production funds. No other nation even has a stealth aircraft on the drawing board. A few nations have small numbers of heavy bombers; the United States has entire wings of heavy bombers.

No other nation maintains an aerial tanker fleet similar to that of the United States; owing to tankers, American bombers can operate anywhere in the world. No other nation has anything like the American AWACS plane, which provides exceptionally detailed radar images of the sky above battles, or the newer JSTARS plane, which provides exceptionally detailed radar images of the ground.

No other nation has air-to-air missiles or air-to-ground smart munitions of the accuracy, or numbers, of the United States. This month, for example, in the second attempt to kill Saddam Hussein, just 12 minutes passed between when a B-1 received the target coordinates and when the bomber released four smart bombs aimed to land just 50 feet and a few seconds apart. All four hit where they were supposed to.

American aerial might is so great that adversaries don't even try to fly. Serbia kept its planes on the ground during the Kosovo conflict of 1999; in recent fighting in Iraq, not a single Iraqi fighter rose to oppose United States aircraft. The governments of the world now know that if they try to launch a fighter against American air power, their planes will be blown to smithereens before they finish retracting their landing gear. The aerial arms race, a central facet of the last 50 years, is over.

The American lead in ground forces is not uncontested — China has a large standing army — but is large enough that the ground arms race might end, too. The United States now possesses about 9,000 M1 Abrams tanks, by far the world's strongest armored force. The Abrams cannon and fire-control system is so extraordinarily accurate that in combat gunners rarely require more than one shot to destroy an enemy tank. No other nation is currently building or planning a comparable tank force. Other governments know this would be pointless, since even if they had advanced tanks, the United States would destroy them from the air.

The American lead in electronics is also huge. Much of the "designating" of targets in the recent Iraq assault was done by advanced electronics on drones like the Global Hawk, which flies at 60,000 feet, far beyond the range of antiaircraft weapons. So sophisticated are the sensors and data links that make Global Hawk work that it might take a decade for another nation to field a similar drone — and by then, the United States is likely to have leapfrogged ahead to something better.

As The New York Times Magazine reported last Sunday, the United States is working on unmanned, remote-piloted drone fighter planes that will be both relatively low-cost and extremely hard to shoot down, and small drone attack helicopters that will precede troops into battle. No other nation is even close to the electronics and data-management technology of these prospective weapons. The Pentagon will have a monopoly on advanced combat drones for years.

An electronics arms race may continue in some fashion because electronics are cheaper than ships or planes. But the United States holds such an imposing lead that it is unlikely to be lapped for a long time. Further, the United States holds an overwhelming lead in military use of space. Not only does the Pentagon command more and better reconnaissance satellites than all the rest of the world combined, American forces have begun using space-relayed data in a significant way. Space "assets" will eventually be understood to have been critical to the lightning conquest of Iraq, and the American lead in this will only grow, since the Air Force now has the second-largest space budget in the world, after NASA's.

This huge military lead is partly because of money. Last year American military spending exceeded that of all other NATO states, Russia, China, Japan, Iraq and North Korea combined, according to the Center for Defense Information, a nonpartisan research group that studies global security. This is another area where all other nations must concede to the United States, for no other government can afford to try to catch up.

The United States military reinforces its pre-eminence by going into combat. Rightly or wrongly, the United States fights often; each fight becomes a learning opportunity for troops and a test of technology. No other military currently has the real-world experience of the United States.

There is also the high quality — in education and motivation — of its personnel. This lead has grown as the United States has integrated women into most combat roles, doubling the talent base on which recruiters can draw.

The American edge does not render its forces invincible: the expensive Apache attack helicopter, for example, fared poorly against routine small-arms fire in Iraq. More important, overwhelming power hardly insures that the United States will get its way in world affairs. Force is just one aspect of international relations, while experience has shown that military power can solve only military problems, not political ones.

Gregg Easterbrook is a senior editor of The New Republic and a contributing editor of The Atlantic Monthly.

**APPENDIX 2 NATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS**

You have been appointed by the president of the United States to the National Security Council. This is our third meeting. Today, I have convened this meeting at the request of the President in order for us to make a recommendation to him with respect to a new, major problem facing us. Consider the following information brought to us last night:

According to our intelligence sources, Russian nuclear submarines, armed with thermonuclear weapons, have been detected off the shores of the following areas:

 San Diego; San Francisco; Miami; New York; Boston.

In all five cases, the submarines are within 150 nautical miles of our continental shores. Apparently, all submarines were moved into their present locations over the last forty eight hours.

The CIA, using both our capabilities, and secure Russian sources, has confirmed the placement of the submarines this morning. We also have confirmation of the missile capabilities on the submarines. This is close proximity to our continental shores, and we are not aware of a single previous instance, even during the Cold War, of any prior attempts by Russia or the former Soviet Union to attempt this pattern of deployment this close to our shores.

**Thus, the situation has become a serious national security problem, and perhaps as well, a serious national security threat.**

We have a request from the President **for an immediate set of recommendations** to him on an appropriate course of action to take.

**Before we can recommend an appropriate course of action, we will need to decide what are Russian intentions. In other words, why would the Russians take this course of action? Our response to this issue will critically affect our recommendations.**

I need you to answer this **why** question at our next meeting. Consider the situation carefully! Our national security is at stake!

**APPENDIX 3 ROLE CHOICES**

 Below, you will find a number of groups that will be involved in role playing during the semester. Please indicate your top three preferences, in the order of your preference, by emailing them to me at volgy@email.arizona.edu, indicating your full name, and listing your preferences in order of choice (1 through 3).

Peoples Republic of China

France

Russian Federation

United Kingdom

United States

Germany

India

Republic of South Africa

Iran

Saudi Arabia

Israel

Turkey

Brazil

**APPENDIX 4 ROLE ASSIGNMENTS**

The first time you meet as a group, you will need to agree on who is going to play what role in your group. As you do, you will need to e-mail me those choices at volgy@email.arizona.edu . This email should be sent to me by the chief decision-maker for the group, as soon as the roles have been parsed out. In the email, please specify the following:

**Name of group\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

##### Simulation role Student’s name E-mail

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX 5 ROLE PLAYING RESEARCH RESPONSIBILITIES**

**First Assignment:**

The first assignment for each group is to divide the group into available roles for each nation. The chief decision-maker will have overall responsibility for the group (As part of the first assignment, the chief decision-maker in each group is responsible for turning in the sheet that is contained in Appendix 4. Please e-mail this information to me at: volgy@email.arizona.edu. Each member of the group should keep the information as well with respect to who plays which role and their respective phone numbers).

--------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Second Assignment:**

The second assignment is to learn as much about your group as possible by the end of **the seventh week of class, although the paper will be due on March 2nd** . At a minimum, you will want to answer the following five questions:

1. What seem to be the major foreign policy goals, interests, objectives of your group (be specific)? Why? Are there any particular domestic problems in your nation with strong implications for your foreign policy objectives and interests?
2. Which other nations and groups seem to be your most important “friends,” “enemies”? Why? What do you mean by friends and enemies?
3. To what extent do the five domestic variables (which we will discuss in class) affect the foreign policies of your country? To what extent do these domestic variables help in understanding the manner in which domestic problems in your nation are/or are not having an effect on your foreign policy objectives and interests?
4. What range of resources do you have available to you to help pursue your foreign policy objectives, including military and economic capabilities (make sure you answer this question in the context of your answers to question 1)? How dependent are you on resources outside of your country?
5. How important is ideology to your group? How about nationalism?

Then, toward the end of the semester (**due April 20th** ), you will want to answer the remaining questions:

1. How actively are you involved with regional or global organizations and alliances? Why?
2. What, if any status considerations drive your foreign policy objectives and actions?
3. What is your group’s position on global climate change?
4. What is your group’s position on globalized free trade?
5. What is your group’s position on fighting global terrorism?

 To do the research necessary to answer these questions, it is strongly advised that you work as a group and divide responsibility for the research, coordinate the effort, and pool the research each of you will pursue. In cases of groups where your research may be highly interdependent (e.g., Bosnia and Serbia, etc.), for the purposes of the research only, it is permissible for these groups to work with each other and share information during the research phase. (CAUTION: each member of the group will be held responsible for the overall group project.)

 In doing your research, you will want to consult several sources, including, but not limited to the following:

* **Current events sources:**

Checkthrough at least one of the following sources, for at least the last three years for your country: New York Times Index; Keesing’s Contemporary Archives; Facts on File; FBIS (Foreign Broadcast Information Service). There are current events sources for several of your nations as well on the Internet, and links are available for many on them on my web page for this course. You can also see your nation’s involvement in the UN and (indirectly perspectives of your nation’s decision makers on international relations through the General Debates of the Plenary Session of the United Nation’s General Assembly (<http://www.un.org/ga/20special/ga54/IndexE.htm>).

1. **National resources:** a good world almanac of the most recent vintage. Further information is available as well from the annual volumes of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, SIPRI, publications of the World Bank and IMF, and the UN Yearbook of International Statistics.
2. **General foreign policy analysis:** see these journals for articles regarding your country’s foreign policy: *Foreign Policy; Foreign Affairs; World Politics Review*
3. **Faculty resources:** there are a number of faculty who have expertise in your area, both in the political science department, and in other departments on campus. You may wish to chat with them. **Caution:** don’t go unprepared! If you want their help, have very specific question ready to ask of them.
4. **Some additional quality internet sites:**

WWW Virtual Library: International Affairs Resources (<http://www.etown.edu/vl/>)

MSU Global Access (<http://www.msuglobalaccess.net>)

Internet for Diplomats (<http://internetfordiplomats.com>)

International Relations and Security Network (<http://www.isn.ethz.ch>)

Diplomaticnet (<http://www.diplomaticnet.com>)

World Politics Review ([http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/))

Stratfor Global Intelligence (<http://www.stratfor.com>)

For current events on Russia, see <http://russialist.org/> and if you wish, you can subscribe for free to Johnson’s Russia list, which send people (several times a week) commentary on Russian domestic and foreign policy. You can subscribe by sending a message to davidjohnson@starpower.net

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

CAUTION: keep a list of references, in a separate WORD file. These you will need to turn in at the end of the semester. They will have to reflect the full array of references you used in compiling the paper, and any other references you read after you had submitted the paper as you are updating your knowledge of your group and your role. The references are due at on the last day of classes (one set of references from each group)

----------------------------------------------------------------

**Third Assignment:** Realistically participate in role playing (more on this later, including role playing rules)

----------------------------------------------------------

**Fourth Assignment: (due no later than May 2nd , via e-mail, to me):** Two evaluations, one a group evaluation of your performance, jointly done together, and the second, your own evaluation of yourself and each other member of your group (See Appendix 6 and 7).

**APPENDIX 6 ROLE EVALUATION: INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENTS**

Evaluate your own participation in your group. How helpful were you to others in the group? How much did you personally contribute to the group’s performance?

 Evaluate each one of the other members of your group separately, using the same questions which you used to evaluate yourself.

 On the basis of these evaluations, assign a letter grade to yourself, and to each other member of the group.

(This assignment is **due May 2nd**. Send the evaluation to me to my email address at volgy@email.arizona.edu)

**APPENDIX 7 GROUP EVALUATIONS**

Each group is asked to provide a final evaluation of its own group. This is your last opportunity to explain, justify, and rationalize your group’s behavior and the policy positions you have taken.

 Instead of rehashing all the steps you took in playing your role, you should focus on the following:

 1) How realistically did your group behave? What criteria are you using to justify your “realism”?

 2) If you did not behave realistically at critical times, discuss how you could have changed your behavior to make it more realistic?

 3) What decision-making processes did you use to decide what you were going to do?

 4) How did you use your knowledge of alliance systems to guide your activities?

 5) How did you take care to integrate considerations of domestic variables with your foreign policy behavior?

**Caution and critical: This assignment is not meant to rehash what you did. Instead, it is designed to give you another opportunity to show how well you’ve understood the principles we covered in the course, and how you can apply them to current events, either by showing how you used them, or how you failed to use them in playing your role, but now understand how you could have done so. In that sense, this is a crucial, thinking exercise.**

(Note: these evaluations will be **due May 2nd.**)(Please send it to me electronically/email to volgy@email.arizona.edu )