**Understanding International Security**

Fall 2023

Friday from 9:00 AM to 12:50 PM

Room 101, 140-1

Instructor: LEE Jaewon (jaewon.lee@snu.ac.kr)

Office Hour: After each class and by appointment

TA: Ms. PARK Jisoo (jisoo1998@snu.ac.kr)

Course Description

The course discusses national and international security affairs in contemporary world politics. For this, first, the course will explore theoretical and historical literature concerning the role of force and national security affairs. Second, it will examine basic concepts, theories, and historical cases in international security, with particular attention on security dynamics in East Asia and beyond. The course aims to provide students with basic knowledge and training in analyzing and planning national security policies. It is also designed to enhance students’ understanding of contemporary security dynamics in 21st-century international relations and East Asia.

**\* This is a prerequisite course for East Asian National Security Strategy in the Spring semester.**

\*\*Following new school guidelines, classes may be held in the classroom with some possible Zoom classes

Grading Policy

Attendance and class discussion: 20%

Mid-term exam: 30% (Quiz 20%, A short essay 10%)

Group Presentation: 25%

An Executive Briefing: 25%

Assignment Guidelines

1. Attendance is important for students to participate in class activities. Students must come to class prepared to elaborate on their thoughtful analyses of the assigned readings. Please be advised that questions for the mid-term exam will be based on a lecture given in class, not textbooks. Good attendance and active participation will be reflected in grades. According to school regulations, missing more than one-third of the class will result in an F grade.

2. The mid-term exam/assignment will be a short quiz on week 6 (October 20) and a short essay due on week 9 (November 10) to discuss major concepts and theories examined in the lecture. No make-up will be arranged. Please note the quiz schedule and plan for it.

3. In their presentation, students would discuss the national security strategy of six countries in Northeast Asia: South and North Korea, China, Japan, Russia, and the United States. For this presentation, the team should define each country’s national security interest based on David Baldwin’s seven criteria: whose security values, how much security, from what threats, through what means, at what cost, and in what time span. Especially to define the cost, the presentation should compare each country’s defense spending and social security (welfare) budget.

Students would form a country team of their choice and answer the following questions. First, what is the most important national security interest of each country? Second, what is the defense spending trend compared to other priorities (i.e., social welfare) in the government budget for the last ten years? Third, is each country spending too much or too little for their national security in terms of their increasing social welfare demand? Finally, policy recommendations for each country’s national security strategy. For this, each team is advised to refer to resources from the SIPRI yearbook, IISS Military Balance, Jane’s Defense Annuls, CIA World Fact Book, Country Report by the Economist Intelligence Unit, defense white papers, government documents, and data on demography and social welfare spending of each country. Each team will be given 50 minutes for oral presentation, including Q&A.

4. For the final-term assignment, each student should submit an executive briefing discussing a topic given by the end of the semester.

Students are always welcome to ask the instructor for clarification during or after class when they feel confused. Yet, if you miss a class, please do not come to the instructor for an explanation or the lecture note of the missed class. You may contact other students about this. After each class, PowerPoint lecture presentations will be posted on the school ETL website.

All students must exhibit professionalism in and out of the classroom. Students are required to uphold an honor code regarding “academic standards, cheating, plagiarism, and the documentation of written work” and be aware of the responsibility.

Course schedule and assigned readings/subject to change.

**Week 1** (September 1) **Introduction**: How to best understand the making of national security strategy? Who and how to do it?

* Course Overview
* Self-introduction
* Q&A

**No class on September 8!!**

**Week 2** (September 15) **Defining Security**: How to define each country’s security interest in Northeast Asia?

* Conceptual definition of security
* Traditional approaches
* Post-Cold War approaches

Required

Baldwin, David A. “The concept of security.” In *National and International Security*, pp. 41-62. Routledge, 2018.

Nye Jr, Joseph S. “Conflicts after the Cold War.” *Washington Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (1996): 4-24.

Brodie, Bernad. “Vital Interests: What are They, and Who Says So?.” *War and Politics* Chapter 8, pp. 433-496.

Recommended

Wolfers, Arnold. ““National security” as an ambiguous symbol.” *Political science quarterly* 67, no. 4 (1952): 481-502.

Rothschild, Emma. “What is security?.” *Daedalus* 124.3 (1995): 53-98.

Buzan, Barry. “Rethinking security after the Cold War.” *Cooperation and conflict* 32.1 (1997): 5-28.

Williams, Michael C. “Words, images, enemies: Securitization and international politics.” *International studies quarterly* 47.4 (2003): 511-531.

**Week 3** (September 22) **War**: What could be a possible cause of war in East Asia?

* What is war? Clausewitz and Sun-Tzu
* Realism and causes of war
* Macro vs Micro cause of war
* Offense & Defense dynamics
* International system structure

Required

Sun-Tzu, *The Art of War* New York: The Modern Library (2000), pp. 71-123.

Clausewitz, Carl. “What is War?” *On War.* Princeton: Princeton University Press (1976), pp.75-126; 577-610l.

Brodie, Bernad. “Some Theories on the Causes of War” *War and Politics* Chapter 7, pp. 276-340.

Mearsheimer, John J. *The tragedy of great power politics*. WW Norton & Company, 2001, pp.334-402.

Monteiro, Nuno P. “Unrest assured: Why unipolarity is not peaceful.” *International Security* 36, no. 3 (2011): 9-40.

Wohlforth, William C. “Unipolarity, status competition, and great power war.” *World politics* 61, no. 1 (2009): 28-57.

Van Evera, Stephen. “Offense, defense, and the causes of war.” *International Security* 22, no. 4 (1998): 5-43.

Recommended

Allison, Graham. “The Thucydides trap: are the US and China headed for war?.” *The Atlantic* 24, no. 9 (2015): 1-18. <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/09/united-states-china-war-thucydides-trap/406756/>

Posen, Barry. “Ukraine’s Implausible Theories of Victory.” *Foreign Affairs, July* 8 (2022).

Kang, David C. “International relations theory and the second Korean war.” *International Studies Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (2003): 301-324.

**No class on September 29!! (Happy Chuseok Holidays!)**

**Week 4** (October 6) **Strategy**: What is the National Security Strategy of East Asian Countries?

* National Security and Strategy
* The National Security Decision-making process
* Executive branches, legislature, intelligence, the military
* Civil-military relations

Required

Liddell Hart, B. H. “The classic book on military strategy.” (1954). Pp.319-360.

Brodie, Bernad. “Strategic Thinkers, Planners, Decision-Makers” *War and Politics* Chapter 8, pp. 433-496.

Kennedy, Paul M., ed. *Grand strategies in war and peace*. Yale University Press, 1991. pp. 1-7.

Brands, Hal. *What good is grand strategy? Power and purpose in American statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush*. Cornell University Press, 2018. pp.1-16.

Murray, Williamson, MacGregor Knox, and Alvin Bernstein, eds. *The making of strategy: rulers, states, and war*. Cambridge University Press, 1996. Chapter 1. pp.1-23.

Strachan, Hew. “The lost meaning of strategy.” In *Strategic Studies*, pp. 431-446. Routledge, 2008.

Cohen, Eliot A. *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime*. Simon and Schuster, 2002. pp.1-51.

Recommended

Biden Jr, Joseph R., and EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT WASHINGTON DC. “National Security Strategy.” (2022).

Walt, Stephen. “Biden Needs Architects, Not Mechanics, to Fix US Foreign Policy.” *Foreign Policy* 12.

**Week 5** (October 13) **Use of Force**: How to manage crisis on the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, East-China Sea, and South China Sea

* Defense, Deterrence, Compellence, Swaggering
* Preemption vs prevention
* Coercive diplomacy

Required

Robert Art, “The Four Functions of Force,” in Robert Art and Robert Jervis, *International Politics* 5th ed. (New York: Longman, 2000), pp. 156-168.

George, Alexander L. “Coercive Diplomacy,” in Art and Waltz, The Use of Force, pp. 70-76.

Jentleson, Bruce W., and Christopher A. Whytock. “Who “won” Libya? The force-diplomacy debate and its implications for theory and policy.” *International Security* 30, no. 3 (2005): 47-86.

Art, Robert. “The Fungibility of Force” in Art, Robert J., and Kenneth Neal Waltz, eds. *The use of force: military power and international politics*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2009. pp.3-22.

Recommended

Drezner, Daniel W. “Military primacy doesn’t pay (nearly as much as you think).” *International Security* 38, no. 1 (2013): 52-79.

Crisis Group Report, “North Korea: The Risk of War in the Yellow Sea,” (December 23, 2010), pp.1-37

Sheen, Seong-ho. “US Coercive Diplomacy toward Pyongyang: Obama vs. Trump.” *Korean journal of defense analysis* 32, no. 4 (2020): 517-538.

**Week 6** (October 20) **Mid-term Exam**

**Week 7** (October 27) **Alliance**: Will the US-ROK Alliance Continue in the 21st Century?

* Means of security
* Collective Security
* Collective Defense
* Alliance

Required

Snyder, Glenn Herald. *Alliance Politics*. Cornell University Press, 1997. Pp.129-161.

Walt, Stephen M. *The origins of alliance*. Cornell University Press, 1990. pp.1-49; 262-286.

Morrow, James D. “Alliances: Why Write Them Down?”. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3, no. 1 (2000): 63-83.

Schweller, Randall L. *Deadly imbalances: Tripolarity and Hitler’s strategy of world conquest*. Columbia University Press, 1998. pp.1-91.

Christensen, Thomas J., and Jack Snyder. “Chain gangs and passed bucks: Predicting alliance patterns in multipolarity.” *International organization* 44, no. 2 (1990): 137-168.

Beckley, Michael. “The myth of entangling alliances: Reassessing the security risks of US defense pacts.” *International Security* 39, no. 4 (2015): 7-48.

Kim, Tongfi. "Why alliances entangle but seldom entrap states." *Security Studies* 20, no. 3 (2011): 350-377.

Recommend

Walt, Stephen M. “Alliances in a unipolar world.” *World politics* 61, no. 1 (2009): 86-120.

Cook, James L. “Military Alliances in the 21st Century: Still Relevant after all These Years?.” *Orbis* 57, no. 4 (2013): 559-573.

Kim, Tongfi, Keren Yarhi-Milo, Alexander Lanoszka, and Zack Cooper. "Arms, alliances, and patron-client relationships." *International Security* 42, no. 3 (2017): 183-186.

Weitsman, Patricia A. "Intimate enemies: The politics of peacetime alliances." *Security Studies* 7, no. 1 (1997): 156-193.

Dujarric, Robert. “US Military Presence and Northeast Asian Regional Stability: Comparative Perspective between US-Japan Alliance and US-Korea Alliance and the Future of the Alliances.” *Korea Observer* 36, no. 3 (2005): 445.

Liff, Adam P. "Unambivalent alignment: Japan’s China strategy, the US alliance, and the ‘hedging’fallacy." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 19, no. 3 (2019): 453-491.

**Week 8** (November 3) **Nuclear Deterrence**: Will deterrence work against North Korea’s nuclear weapons?

* Use of the Atomic Bomb
* Three debates: nuclear deterrence, missile defense, nuclear terrorism
* US extended deterrence and Korea

Required

Reed, Thomas, and Danny Stillman. *The nuclear express: A political history of the bomb and its proliferation*. Zenith press, 2010. pp. 8-53.

Brodie, Bernad. “On Nuclear Weapons: Utility in Nonuse” *War and Politics* Chapter 9, pp. 375-432.

Louis Morton, “The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb,” in The Use of Force, pp. 165-180.

Kenneth N. Waltz, “Nuclear Myths and Political Realities,” in The Use of Force, pp. 102-118.

Sagan, Scott Douglas, and Kenneth Neal Waltz. *The spread of nuclear weapons: a debate renewed* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2003) pp.46-124.

, “Missile Defense and the Multiplication of Nuclear Weapons,” in The Use of Force, 6th ed., pp. 347-352

Hiim, Henrik Stålhane, M. Taylor Fravel, and Magnus Langset Trøan. "The dynamics of an entangled security dilemma: China's changing nuclear posture." *International Security* 47, no. 4 (2023): 147-187.

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 (2017): 9-49.

Recommend

Schelling, Thomas C. "Arms and influence Yale University press." *New Haven* (1966). pp. 1-51.

Monteiro, Nuno P., and Alexandre Debs. "The Strategic Logic of Nuclear Proliferation." *International Security* 39, no. 2 (1995): 4.

Pettyjohn, Stacie, and Jennie Matuschak. *Long Shadows: Deterrence in a Multipolar Nuclear Age*. Center for a New American Security, 2022.

Allison, Graham. "How to stop nuclear terror." *Foreign Aff.* 83 (2004): 64.

Karako, Thomas. *FPI Analysis: The Future of Missile Defense in the Asia Pacific*. Foreign Policy Initiative., 2017. http://foreignpolicyi.org/files/2017-05-31-Analysis-The%20Future%20of%20Missile%20Defense%20in%20the%20Asia%20Pacific\_0.pdf

Sagan, Scott D. "The Korean missile crisis: Why deterrence is still the best option." *Foreign Aff.* 96 (2017): 72-82.

Khoo, Nicholas. "Retooling great power nonproliferation theory: Explaining China's North Korea nuclear weapons policy." *The Pacific Review* 34, no. 4 (2021): 523-546.

Terry, Sue Mi. "North Korea's Nuclear Family: How the Kims Got the Bomb and Why They Won't Give It up." *Foreign Aff.* 100 (2021): 115. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/north-korea/2021-08-24/north-koreas-nuclear-family

**Week 9** (November 10) **Morality and War**: How to deal with human rights issues in East Asia: Myanmar, North Korea, Xinjiang, and Afghanistan?

**You must submit a short essay (1 page). An introduction will be given on Week 7!**

Required

Grotius, Hugo. *Hugo Grotius on the law of war and peace*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Nye Joseph Jr, S. "Joseph, Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History." (2005). pp. 20-28.

Kennan, George F. "Morality and foreign policy." *Foreign Affairs* 64, no. 2 (1985): 205-218.

Smith, Michael J. "Humanitarian intervention: An overview of the ethical issues." *Ethics & International Affairs* 12 (1998): 63-79.

Power, Samantha. "A problem from hell: America and the age of genocide." (2002). pp.1-46.

Recommend

ICISS, The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, December 2001, XII, pp.1-108

<http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>

International Committee of the Red Cross, International Humanitarian Law: Answer to Your Question, pp. 1-100

Barry Posen, “Military Responses to Refugee Disasters,” in Art and Waltz, The Use of Force, pp. 415-435

Azeem Ibrahim, “Myanmar Has Blazed a Path to Democracy Without Rights,” Foreign Policy, January 16, 2020 <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/01/16/myanmar-democracy-rohingya/>

Derek J. Mitchell, “The Looming Catastrophe in Myanmar; Failure to Act Will Lead to a Failed State,” Foreign Affairs, April 15, 2021 <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/burma-myanmar/2021-04-15/looming-catastrophe-myanmar>

Colum Lynch, “State Department Lawyers Concluded Insufficient Evidence to Prove Genocide in China,” Foreign Policy, FEBRUARY 19, 2021 <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/02/19/china-uighurs-genocide-us-pompeo-blinken/>

**Week 10** (November 17): **Terrorism and Cyber Security**: Is terrorism still a serious threat?

* Prevalence of Low Intensity Conflicts
* Terrorism/Cyber Security
* Preemption/Prevention

Required

Samuel, Huntington. "The clash of civilizations." *Foreign affairs* 72, no. 3 (1993): 22-49.

Robert Kaplan, “The Coming Anarchy,” The Atlantic Monthly (February 1994)

Brian M. Jenkins, “International Terrorism,” in The Use of Force, 6th ed., pp. 77-84

Kello, Lucas. "The meaning of the cyber revolution: Perils to theory and statecraft." *International Security* 38, no. 2 (2013): 7-40.

Harknett, Richard J., and Joseph S. Nye Jr. "Is deterrence possible in cyberspace?." *International Security* 42, no. 2 (2017): 196-199.

Nye Jr, Joseph S. "The end of cyber-anarchy?: How to build a new digital order." *Foreign Aff.* 101 (2022): 32.

Recommended

David Rapoport, “Sacred Terror: A Contemporary example from Islam”, in Walter Reich ed. The Origins of Terrorism (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1990), pp. 103-130.

Walter Laquer, “The Changing Face of Terror,” in The Use of Force, 6th ed., pp. 450-457

Cronin, Audrey Kurth. "Behind the curve: Globalization and international terrorism." *International security* 27, no. 3 (2002): 30-58.

Graeme Wood, “What ISIS Really Wants,” The Atlantic, (March 2015) <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/03/what-isis-really-wants/384980/>

Daniel Byman, “The Good Enough Doctrine: Learning to Live With Terrorism

Foreign Affairs, September/October 2021 <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/middle-east/2021-08-24/good-enough-doctrine>

The White House, “President Bush Visits National Defense University, Discuss Global War on Terror,” (Washington, D.C. West Point, New York, October 23, 2007) http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2007/10/20071023-3.html

Barack Obama, “Remarks by the President at the National Defense University,” (National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. May 23, 2013) <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/23/remarks-president-national-defense-university>

Remarks by President Biden on the End of the War in Afghanistan, AUGUST 31, 2021 <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/08/31/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-end-of-the-war-in-afghanistan/>

**Week 11** (November 24) **Economic Security**: What is new about economic security in the 21st century?

* Economic statecraft
* Economic coercion
* Economic deterrence as anti-coercion

Required

Aggarwal, V. K., & Reddie, A. W. (2021). Economic statecraft in the 21st century: Implications for the future of the global trade regime. *World Trade Review, 20*(2), 137-151.

Mastanduno, M. (1998). Economics and Security in Statecraft and Scholarship. *International Organization, 52*(4), 825-854.

Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion. *International Security, 44*(1), 42-79.

Nye Jr, J. S. (2020). Power and interdependence with China. *The Washington Quarterly, 43*(1), 7-21.

Recommended

Baldwin, D. A. (2020). *Economic Statecraft*: New Edition. Princeton University Press. Chapter 3, 8 and 11.

Blackwill, R., & Harris, J. (2016). *War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Press. Chapters 1-3.

Copeland, D. C. (1996). Economic interdependence and war: A theory of trade expectations*. International security, 20*(4), 5-41.

Drezner, D. W. (2003). The hidden hand of economic coercion. *International Organization, 57*(3), 643-659.

Cha, V. (2023). “How to Stop Chinese Coercion:  The Case for Collective Resilience,” *Foreign Affairs* 102 (January/February 2023).

Kim, D. J. (2019). Economic Deterrence Through Economic Engagement. *Foreign Policy Analysis, 15*(2), 176-186.

Harrell, P., Elizabeth Rosenberg, and Edoardo Saravalle*.* (2018)*. China’s use of coercive economic measures*. Washington, DC: Center for a New American Security.

**Week 12** (December 1) **Group Presentation and Debate (the US, China)**

**Week 13** (December 8) **Group Presentation and Debate (the EU, Russia)**

**Week 14** (December 15) **Group Presentation (Japan, ROK and DPRK)**

**Week 15** (December 22): **Final Take Home Executive Brief**