

---

## GRAPPLING WITH TRANSNATIONAL ISSUES: GLOBAL SECURITY POLICY THROUGH AGENCY AND ETHICS

---

**Sarah Fisher, University of Georgia**

### INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

---

The "Global Security Policy" syllabus and discussion that follows is for an upper division, face-to-face course for undergraduate students majoring in Political Science and/or International Affairs at a large research intensive university, though this course could be adapted to different learning environments. The original format for this class was three hours a day, five days a week for a "Maymester" course. I have reformatted this course schedule to fit a semester length class that meets two times a week.

In creating this course, I had several factors in mind. First, "Global Security Policy" is not a widely accepted subfield of International Relations (IR); as such, there is no canonical literature or standard approach to the topic. Yet, the issues facing modern states, international organizations, and individual policy makers are increasingly transnational in character. Issues such as cyber warfare or climate change have repercussions for all actors- states, nongovernmental organizations, or even individuals. Being able to grapple with these transnational issues is crucial for political science/international relations majors but also for students interested in policy work.

Second, given that this subfield lacks an accepted structure, I approached Global Security Policy thematically. Rubin's (2012) focus on themes and essential questions informed some of this thought process. I centered this class around two concepts -- the agency/structure debate and ethics. Agency/structure and ethics have clear scholarly implications (on the significance of this topic in international relations see Wendt 1987; for the significance of this topic in education see Dolby 2003) and are concepts that are applicable to the incredibly wide range of actors and topics in Global Security Policy. In an undergraduate classroom, issues in international affairs can often be contentious -- in part because they have to do with ethical and moral questions. In international relations, talking about issues of deterrence or nuclear proliferation should never be too far from ethical questions. Focusing on ethics from day one starts to create a "community of learners" in which "you must treat everyone with respect and compassion -- especially when it is hard to do" (Ayers & Tanner 2010, p. 38). Ethical issues are difficult to discuss among any group of people, but grappling with questions about foreign aid, atomic bombs, or just war can become unwieldy if an instructor has not created an environment of respect.

Third, given the contentious issues we discussed in this course, I wanted to create an environment where students felt comfortable participating in class, even if his/her view was not the majority. I wanted to create a classroom environment in which students had ample time for discussion and debate while providing students with an opportunity to tackle a pressing issue in a policy paper. To achieve these goals, I employed many discussion techniques described in this article (for more detail on these discussion techniques and others like them see Mobley & Fisher 2014). In addition, the primary assignment for this course was a Policy Paper rather than a research paper. This assignment asked students to create policy recommendations for a pressing global issue of their choice.

The course schedule is set up as follows.

Readings: What readings would be assigned for that week. With the exception of one popular press book, each of these should be available via a university library system. I have not assigned the readings to a particular day; rather, I have given a list of readings that would be appropriate for an instructor to assign for that particular week.

Instructor note: I have included more detailed descriptions of class activities, rationale for choosing particular topics/activities, and other notes in the "Instructor notes" section.

## **SYLLABUS**

---

### **RELEVANCE, THEMES, AND COURSE STRUCTURE**

---

Issues facing countries, organizations, and individuals are increasingly transnational in character. Many courses in Political Science and International Relations fail to capture the complexity and the difficulty of dealing with these transnational issues. For instance, courses like American Foreign Policy view issues through a single lens rather than attempting to take a bird's eye view of a problem facing the global community.

To remedy some of these issues, we explore conflicts in global security policy using agency and ethics as our guiding concepts. For the purposes of this class, "agency" refers to the degree that individuals have a "choice." Agency often stands at odds with "structure" - constraints placed on the decision maker whether in the form of bureaucracies, international norms, or technological capabilities. In addition to the agency/structure debate, we will also delve into ethical considerations in Global Security Policy. We will discuss normative questions (such as "what are the ethical dilemmas surrounding nuclear weapons?") but also, and perhaps more importantly, we will debate and discuss actors' ethical responsibilities to multiple audiences (domestic audiences, international audiences, or even individuals). By the end of this course, you will have a grasp on the major debates and issues relating to agency and ethics in Global Security Policy.

### **LEARNING OUTCOMES**

---

- Be able to frame policy problems- both "traditional" and "nontraditional" problems- in terms of agency and ethics.
- Be able to interpret historical and current events in light of agency and ethics as well as theories of international relations.
- Be comfortable verbally presenting an argument in a classroom setting.
- Be able to write a coherent policy brief detailing potential solutions for a current policy dilemma.

## ASSESSMENT

---

### 10% Unannounced Quizzes

### 10% Attendance and Participation

If you attend every class, but never say a word, you can expect to get a poor participation grade. Participation entails **thoughtfully** asking questions, answering questions, providing feedback to classmates' questions, etc.

### 20% Reading Responses

Throughout the semester must write **five** 250-300 word responses to a day's readings. These response papers are due as **hard copies** at the beginning of class. All of these response papers are due by June 4. **DO NOT SUMMARIZE.** These response posts are meant to be informal responses to the readings. You may critique or expand upon one particular reading or question, focus on the readings as a whole, or draw connections between the readings and class material/current events. There is a firm word count requirement (250-300 words). Do not go wildly (a few dozen words) below or above that range. I grade these on a 0, check minus (below average work, C/B-), check (average work, B/B+), and check plus basis (outstanding work, A).

Instructor Note: Agarwal-Rangnath (2013) argues that students should write every day in the classroom. In line with this instructional goal, the emphasis for this assignment is on analysis rather than summary. I have also found that for this kind of assignment, grading students on a check minus, check, and check plus basis makes them less concerned about the number/letter grade and focus more on critical analysis.

### 25% Final

Instructor Note: Given the thematic focus for this class, the final was centered on agency and ethics as guiding concepts. A few days prior, I gave the students some idea of what the final would look like, and the box below is the actual text of the class final. From an instructor's perspective, this was an effective way to structure the final because there was a great deal of variation both in terms of the readings students analyzed and the ability of students to connect these themes to the readings (especially in Part I).

#### **FINAL- Global Security Policy**

You will write answers to these on loose leaf paper (as provided in class). Do **NOT** write your name on any of the pages of your answer. Write your name only on the top of this sheet. You will staple this sheet to your responses.

#### **PART I: Agency, Ethics, and the Readings (two essays, 25% each = 50% of Final Exam grade)**

\*\*\*\*\*You must choose four **different** readings. In addition, you may not compare readings that fell on the same day; for example, Kaplan was assigned on the same day as Adams and Leatherman. You may NOT compare/contrast these two for one of your short essay questions.

**Questions 1:** Compare and contrast TWO readings from the semester. Connect these readings to either **agency/structure** or **ethics**. Throughout your analysis, be sure to address 1) the authors' primary arguments 2) the authors' primary evidence 3) any major holes or underdeveloped points in their arguments. Be as specific as possible and back up what you say.

**Question 2:** Compare and contrast TWO readings from the semester (two readings that you did NOT choose in Question 1). Connect these readings to either **agency/structure** or **ethics**. Throughout your analysis, be sure to address 1) the authors' primary arguments 2) the authors' primary evidence 3) any major holes or underdeveloped points in their arguments. Be as specific as possible and back up what you say.

**PART II: (50% of Final Exam grade)**

**Question 3:** In *The Great Convergence*, Mahbubani lays out a vision for what might be considered "global security policy."

- **Briefly** explain Mahbubani's vision for global security.
- Do you agree or disagree with Mahbubani's assessment? (You can be somewhere in the middle, just be sure to explain what you agree with and what you don't).
  - Why? Explain.
- You must answer this question using two "issue areas" that we've discussed this semester (ex. cyber security and human security). In your answer, be sure to bring in readings and lecture material from this course. Be as specific as possible and back up what you say.

**35% Policy Paper**

**Global Security Policy- Policy Paper Assignment\***

**General points**

- Pick a topic you find interesting! You'll have an easier time researching, and I'll have an easier time grading.
- The end product will be a 4-6 page double spaced policy paper.
- This is an exercise in learning to identify and focus on key points and practicing writing clearly and coherently.

**Paper Topic- Due via email 11:59pm XX/XX- counts as a quiz grade**

- Email instructor with preferably one (two if necessary) possible topic for your policy paper.
- Again, pick a topic you find interesting! That will make this process much less painful.
- So long as I have your paper topic in my inbox by 11:59pm (not 12:01 am), you'll get a free 100% quiz grade- easiest quiz of the whole semester. If you don't get paper topics to me by 11:59pm, you get a zero (no, I don't care that your computer froze as you hit the send button).

**Annotated Bibliography -- Due via email 11:59pm XX/XX – 5% of total grade**

- You must include bibliographic information for at least 8 sources.
- Following every bibliography entry, include a few sentences about what this source said, how it was useful, etc. In other words, prove to me that you've read those sources.
- This is graded on a complete/incomplete basis. If you turn in an annotated bibliography with at least 8 sources, properly annotated, you'll get 100%. If you turn in a late assignment, do not include at least 8 sources, or fail to annotate all 8, you'll get a zero.

**Preliminary Draft of Paper – Due AT THE BEGINNING of class XX/XX- 5% of total grade**

- Bring a draft copy of your paper to class with you on XX/XX.

- In class, we will conduct a peer review process. The draft of your paper will be read by at least two of your classmates.
- This is graded on a complete/incomplete basis. Drafts should be at least 2 double spaced pages long (not including bibliography and header). If you have at least 2 pages, you'll get full credit. Less than 2 pages/late assignment/no assignment will earn you zero points.

**Final Paper- Due via email by 9:30am on XX/XX**

- **Worth 25% of total grade**

**Specifics**

- This paper is designed to be a policy brief, not a research paper.
  - Be ruthless in your editing. Provide facts, not fluff.
  - I've given you a skeleton of what your paper should look like- use it.

Your paper **must** have the following four main subdivisions and appropriate subheadings. You should also have transition sentences shifting from one section to another.

**The Issue (1-2 paragraphs)**

What is your research question? State the question you are discussing clearly within the first two paragraphs, preferably in the first sentence.

Explain why the issue is a hot topic

Explain what actor's perspective you are adopting

Do not get into much background or pros and cons in this section

This section should include a **thesis statement** and a roadmap of the paper.

**Background (1-2 pages)**

The background you provide should be relevant to your question

For example, you don't need intricate details on the Cuban revolution in a paper examining whether the US should drop sanctions on Cuba.

Don't go overboard on the background of the issue -- it is to support the other parts of the paper, not be the central focus.

**Policy Alternatives (2 pages or so)**

Start with an overview paragraph of alternatives

You should have at least two, preferably three alternatives

It may be useful to create a further subheading for each alternative

Make sure your alternatives create policy directions that cannot be pursued simultaneously

You can pursue alternative 1 **or** alternative 2 **or** alternative 3

Do not use bullets in this section. You should write everything out in paragraph form.

In discussing your pros and cons, don't argue so far to one side that you undermine your overall legitimacy.

If these issues were so simple to solve (and there was clearly one right answer), they would have been solved many years ago.

**Acknowledge the key arguments of the other side, rebut them, and then argue why your position makes the most sense.**

Be careful with subjective, judgmental words such as "wrong" or "should have."

**Recommendation (2-3 paragraphs)**

You must choose **one** of the alternatives you have discussed

Briefly summarize why your recommendation is the best overall choice

Don't bring in new information

\*The author would like to thank Dr. Kathy Hawk at the University of Alabama in Huntsville for sharing this assignment.

## **COURSE MATERIAL**

---

**Required text:** Mahbubani, Kishore. 2013. *The Great Convergence: Asia, the West, and the Logic of One World*. Public Affairs. - this is a popular press book available for ~\$24 (new, including shipping).

Other readings for this course will be available exclusively from the library's web site or elsewhere on the internet. You are expected to read, question, and understand every reading.

## **SCHEDULE**

---

### **UNIT I: Global Security Policy and International Relations**

#### **Week 1: Defining Security, Agency, and Ethics**

Readings: Read and then reread the syllabus. Also familiarize yourself with the course web site.

Part 1:

Introductions and thought exercise- connecting words to International Relations

Go over syllabus & course web site

- Introducing Agency and Ethics

General Discussion:

- What is security? What is global security policy?
- Is this a misnomer?
- Turn to a partner- "What is security?" What is "global security policy"
- Bring back in- write answers on board

Ranking security issues- group activity

- What are the major global security threats of the 21st century? (both from a US perspective and other country's perspective)
- Groups of about 4- come up with a list of threats and then rank them- write top 5 on the board.

- Why did you choose these threats? Are there any common themes we can draw out? What can we do to overcome these threats? Are these threats "new" to the 21st century? If so, how?

Part 2: TED Talk: James Stavridis: A Navy Admiral's thoughts on global security

[http://www.ted.com/talks/james\\_stavridis\\_how\\_nato\\_s\\_supreme\\_commander\\_thinks\\_about\\_global\\_security.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/james_stavridis_how_nato_s_supreme_commander_thinks_about_global_security.html)

- Discussion: what are the dangers of building bridges? What is he missing? Why won't 20th C tools work in the 21st C? What is power? Why is the US doing all of this and not the UN?
- Talk about the paper

## Week 2: Lenses for Global Security Policy: Realism, Liberalism, and other theories of IR

Readings:

Ferguson, Yale H. 2003. Illusions of Superpower. *Asian Journal of Political Science* 11(2): 21-36.

Roasa, Dustin. 2012. China's Soft Power Surge. *Foreign Policy*.

[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/18/chinas\\_soft\\_power\\_surge](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/18/chinas_soft_power_surge)

Putnam, Robert. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games. *International Organization* 42(3): 427-460.

Podcast: Freakonomics Radio. 2010. How Much Does the President Really Matter? 4 November 2010.

Farnham, Barbara. 2004. Impact of the Political Context on Foreign Policy Decision-Making. *Political Psychology* 25(3): 441-463.

Part 1: What is a theory?

A theory is something you do

theory is an explanation of how we understand the world

- Soomo Publishing's Theory Talks- realism, liberalism and constructivism
  - Theory In Action: Realism
  - Theory In Action: Liberalism
  - Theory in Action: Constructivism

List on the board: key terms for these theories

How would each of these theories talk about global security policy?

Part 2:

- Article discussion: Think/Pair/Share

- "Where you stand depends on where you sit"- Divide the class- realist, liberal, constructivist, Marxists, unsure.

Give each group a scenario and see how they dealt with it.

How would you deal with x scenario if you are a realist, liberal, or constructivist?

Scenarios: North Korea shoots a missile into the Pacific Ocean, humanitarian crisis in Sudan, pandemic bird flu erupts in China, poppy production in Afghanistan, Russia invades Georgia, the Syrian government falls to internal rebel forces,

**\*\*\*\*Be prepared to talk about possible policy paper topics (have 1-3 ideas ready to go)**

**Possible policy paper topic**

-Take a moment to think about it, talk about it with a neighbor, we'll talk about it as a group

-Write the topics on the board, see if there are any common themes or thoughts

### **Week 3: Monsters Under the Bed: Threat Perception and Decision-Making**

Readings:

Woods, Kevin, James Lacey and Williamson Murray. 2006. Saddam's Delusions: The View from the Inside. Foreign Affairs

McDermott, Rose. 1992. Prospect Theory in International Relations: The Iranian Hostage Rescue Mission. Political Psychology 13 (2): 237-263

Smith, Steve. 1984. Policy Preferences and Bureaucratic Position: The Case of the American Hostage Rescue Mission. International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-) 61 (1): 9-25.

Levy, Jack S. 1983. Misperceptions and the Causes of War: Theoretical Linkages and Analytical Problems. World Politics 36 (1): 76-99.

Part 1: Decision-Making

Prisoner's Dilemma Game

6 teams, whoever gets the most points wins

Cognitive theories of decision-making: trust, ingroup / outgroup, fairness, fear

Part 2: Threat Construction

Question- Is China a threat to global security?



Propaganda and Threat Construction

Modern Propaganda Slide

**\*\*\*\*Due: by midnight XX/XX/XXXX via email- policy paper topic (counts as a quiz grade!)**

## UNIT II: Issue Areas: Dragons and Snakes

### Week 4: Dragons: Traditional Military Security Issues

Readings:

Kaplan, Robert D. 2005. How We Would Fight China. The Atlantic.

Adams, Gordon and Matthew Leatherman. 2011. A Leaner and Meaner Defense. Foreign Affairs 90(1): 139-152.

Williams, M.J. 2008. The coming revolution in foreign affairs: rethinking American national security. International Affairs 84(6): 1109-1129.

Part 1: Power Point: Class discussion

- what is war, what does it mean to "go to war", what is the goal of war, what is force?

Lecture: Small and light weapons

Why do states go to war?

Kaplan Discussion

- Line of contention- do you agree/disagree with Kaplan  
Do you think this threat is overblown? How would you characterize the threat of interstate war? Are there other threats to worry about besides China if you are the US? What about from other country's perspectives? How would theories of IR deal with China's rise?

Part 2: Primarily Lecture

### Week 5: Nuclear Weapons

Readings:

Sagan, Scott D. 1996-7. Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb. International Security 21(3): 54-86.

Langweiesche, William. 2005. The Wrath of Khan. The Atlantic.

Part 1: Guest Speaker

Part 2: Atomic Café (1982)- 86 min.

**\*\*\*\*Due: Preliminary Annotated Bibliography by midnight on XX/XX**

### **Week 6: China and Global Security**

Readings:

Nathan, Andrew and Andrew Scobell. 2012. How China Sees America. *Foreign Affairs* 91(5): 32-47.

Ikenberry, John G. 2008. The rise of China and the Future of the West. *Foreign Affairs* 87(1): 23-37.

Friedberg, Aaron. 2012. Bucking Beijing. *Foreign Affairs*. 91(5):48-58.

Lee, Pak K., Gerald Chan, and Lai-Ha Chan. 2012. China in Darfur: Humanitarian Rule Maker or Rule-Taker? *Review of International Studies* 38(02): 423-444

Huiyun, Feng. 2005. The Operational Code of Mao Zedong: Defensive or Offensive Realist? *Security Studies* 14(4): 637-662.

Part 1: Article Discussion and Lecture

Part 2: History of US/Sino Relations in two slides

Primary Source analysis in groups

### **Week 7: Snakes: Political Violence and Civil Wars**

Readings:

King, Charles and Rajan Menon. 2010. Prisoners of the Caucasus. *Foreign Affairs*. 89(4): 20-34.

Byman, Daniel. 2006. Do Targeted Killings Work? *Foreign Affairs*. 85(2): 95-111.

Kalyvas, Stathis. 2003. The Ontology of "Political Violence": Action and Identity in Civil Wars. *Perspectives on Politics*. *American Political Science Association* 1(3): 475-494.

Part 1: Lecture -- Intrastate Violence: civil war and other violence within states

Part 2: Lecture -- Government sponsored violence

### **Week 8: Terrorism, Transnational criminal organizations, and trafficking**

Readings:

Stern, Jessica. 2003. The Protean Enemy. *Foreign Affairs*. July/August: 27-40.

Naim, Moises. Mafia States. 2012. *Foreign Affairs*. 91(3):100-111.

Kapstein, Ethan. 2006. The New Global Slave Trade. *Foreign Affairs*. 85(6): 103-115.

Rapley, John. 2006. The New Middle Ages. 85(3).
Part 1: Non-state actors- nothing new under the sun? Human Trafficking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line of contention- Human trafficking is a security issue</li> </ul>
Part 2: Article Discussion & lecture

**Week 9: Cybersecurity**

Readings: Gross, Michael Joseph. 2012. World War 3.0. Vanity Fair. Segal, Adam. 2012. Chinese Computer Games. Foreign Affairs. Kohlmann, Evan. 2006. The Real Online Terrorist Threat. Foreign Affairs. 85(5): 115-124.
Part 1: What is "cybersecurity"? TED Talk- How Cyberattacks Threaten Real World Peace Lecture
Part 2: Is this form of security/insecurity "new"? Lecture

**Week 10: Economic Security**

Helleiner, Eric. A Bretton Woods Moment? The 2007-2008 crisis and the future of global finance. International Affairs 86(3): 619-636. Sharma, Ruchir. 2012. Broken BRICs. Foreign Affairs. 91(6). Babones, Salvatore. 2011. The Middling Kingdom. Foreign Affairs 90(5): 79-88.
Part 1: Economics and Security Lecture
Part 2: Line of Contention -- "overall, globalization has resulted in more "good" than "bad."
<b>****Due: Preliminary Drafts of Papers in Class</b> Paper writing workshop sometime this week

**Week 11: Human Security: Gender, food, health, environmental security**

Readings: Hudson, Valerie. 2013. Lean Forward. Foreign Policy. Conceicao, Petro and Ronald U. Mendoza. 2009. Anatomy of the Global Food Crisis. Third
---

<p>World Quarterly 30(6): 1159-1182.</p> <p>Gilley, Bruce. 2012. Authoritarian environmentalism and China's response to climate change. Environmental Politics 21(2): 287-307.</p> <p>Harris, Paul G. Bringing the In-Between Back In: Foreign Policy in Global Environmental Politics. Politics and Policy 36(6):914-943.</p> <p>Caprioli, M. 2005. Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict. International Studies Quarterly 49(2): 161-178.</p>
Part 1: Gender as a Security Issue
Part 2: Food and Environment

**Week 12: International Organizations**

<p>Readings:</p> <p>Mearsheimer, John. 1995. The False Promise of International Institutions. International Security. 19(3): 5-49.</p> <p>Jones, Lee. 2007. ASEAN intervention in Cambodia: From Cold War to conditionality. Pacific Review 20(4): 523-550.</p>
Part 1: International Organizations Lecture
Part 2: Platonic Dialogue Review

**UNIT III: Synthesis****Week 13: Synthesis**

Readings: Mahbubani (book)
Part 1: ***** <b>No Class- Papers Due</b>
Part 2: Mahbubani discussion Part 1
Quote Gallery

**Week 14: Synthesis**

Readings: Mahbubani
Part 1: Mahbubani discussion Part 2
Part 2: Course recap- Lines of contention with agency and ethics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did your position on these issues change throughout the semester?</li> </ul>

## **INSTRUCTOR NOTES**

---

Instructors should notice that class activities are frontloaded. In my experience, forcing students to interact with each other at the beginning of the semester has dividends for the rest of the semester. When students are accustomed to talking with one another, rather than just answering the instructor, all class discussion benefits. All of the PowerPoint slides and supporting materials are available online at the author's website

### **Week 1: Defining Security, Agency, and Ethics**

- Introduction and thought exercise
  - I have done this as an introductory exercise several times with good results. Before class, I write down words on slips of paper. Words like "waffle" or "pill" or "leap" that do not (on the surface) have anything to do with international relations work best for this exercise. Before introductions, I ask students to pick a word and connect it to IR. I give them time to talk about it with a neighbor (and introduce themselves to a neighbor) and then share their word (along with introductory comments) with the class.

### **Week 2: Lenses for Global Security Policy: Realism, Liberalism, and other theories of IR**

- Soomo Publishing's videos on Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism are the excellent. Although instructors can certainly explain these concepts, I have found it helpful for students to have these for both reference and variety.
- This week is designed to be a crash course in international relations theory. In this particular class, there were no prerequisites. As a result, there were students for whom this was the first class and others for whom it was the last. Conducting a short review of international relations theory was allowed all of the students to begin with introducing global security policy through these theoretical lenses.

### **Week 3: Monsters Under the Bed: Threat Perception and Decision-Making**

In economics and political science, academics often reference the Prisoner's Dilemma game when discussing game theory. It is a fairly difficult concept to explain, but playing the prisoner's dilemma game is an excellent way to make the concept come to life. (The author would like to thank Dr. Krista Wiegand for sharing this activity).

Simulation: Prisoner's Dilemma Game

- The Prisoner's Dilemma Game is a commonly referenced term in economics and political science.
- Premise of the game is to talk about cooperation and defection. Students are broken into groups and instructed to sit in different parts of the room. The instructor writes the payoffs of the game on the board and explains the rules to the students. For each "round" of the game, the teams decide to "cooperate" or "defect."
- The instructor writes the score on the board.
- After playing the game, the instructor gives a "recap." How do you think these decisions were made?

## **UNIT II: Issue Areas: Dragons and Snakes**

### **Week 4: Dragons: Traditional Military Security Issues**

- Line of Contention: For more information on this discussion activity see Mobley & Fisher 2014. The instructor presents students with statements and asks the students to agree/disagree with

these prompt. For instance, I asked a class of 27 to agree/disagree with the statement "Kaplan's assessment of China is accurate." I presented the statement and informed the students that one side of the room was "strongly agree" while the other side of the room was "strongly disagree." I asked students to get up and align themselves across the front of the room according to where their views fell on the spectrum. Once students had placed themselves at the front of the room, the instructor asks students to talk with those standing next to them and discuss why they "strongly agreed" or "disagreed" or "were neutral" towards the given statement.

### Week 6: China and Global Security

- For Part 2 of this class, I had my students do a primary source analysis with the documents in the note below. The box below is the text of the directions I posted on the course blog. I instructed students to bring their laptops to class if possible, but I also printed one copy of each of these documents for students without laptops.
- This activity got very positive reviews. In particular, some of the documents from The National Security Archive are official, scanned in documents complete with declassification stamps and blacked out text. Although students of history are accustomed to working with primary documents, this is not regular practice in political science.

#### Detailed Directions: Primary Source Analysis - Visual propaganda

- In class, I borrow from Agarwal-Rangnath's (2013) list of questions about primary sources. From (Agarwal-Rangnath 2013: 61): "What is the document? Where is it from? Whom is the author writing the document for? Who benefits from the document? Who does not? What message is being portrayed? What do the words say? What do you learn from the document? What does the author hope to do with this document? Why might the author have a bias? Would you reform the document?" Etc.

The documents I've printed for class and these links are from the "[Internet Modern History Sourcebook](#)" run by Fordham University and "[The National Security Archive](#)" run by George Washington University. If ever you need primary sources for any of your other papers, I recommend starting with these two sites.

Documents:

**Group 1:** Mao's China- scroll down to China, "communist rule"

<http://www.fordham.edu/Halsall/mod/modsbook52.asp>

**Group 2:** China & United States (early years)- scroll down to China, "China Relation with the US"

<http://www.fordham.edu/Halsall/mod/modsbook52.asp>

**Group 3:** Nixon's Trip To China <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB106/index.htm>

**Group 4:** Tiananmen Square <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB16/index.html>

**Group 5: The US, China, and the Bomb**

<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB1/nsaebb1.htm>

**Week 12: International Organizations**

Platonic Dialogue: "A \_\_\_\_\_ and a \_\_\_\_\_ walk into a bar and start talking about \_\_\_\_\_" (Mobley & Fisher 2014, p. 304).

- Ex: A realist and a liberal walk into a bar and start talking about civil war in Syria.
- Groups of four, pick your type of theorist (realist, liberal, constructivist, feminist, critical theorist) and your topic (international organizations, military buildup, cyber issues, etc.).
  - Work as a group of four- two people write the dialogue, two people perform it for the class.
- This is a version of "Dialogue Poems" found in Agarwal-Rangnath (2013, p. 80).

**UNIT III: Synthesis****Week 13:**

Quote Gallery (for more information see Mobley & Fisher 2014)

- For the Mahbubani book, the instructor chooses a handful of quotes that are particularly interesting or controversial.
- Print out quotes from slides
- Tape an extra sheet to the bottom of that page
- Have students go around the room, silently, and comment on more than ½ of the quotes.
- Can be questions, comments, reactions both to the quote and their classmates comments
- Rotate so that everyone has seen all quotes
- Have students go to one quote that they liked, talk to classmates around the quote and discuss the quote with the class

**Week 14: Synthesis**

- Instructor Note:
- Lines of contention were particularly interesting for issues of agency and ethics at the end of the semester. Students aligned themselves on issues like "individuals are in full control of their lives." Reflecting on the readings and discussion throughout the class, this was an opportunity for students to apply their knowledge to particular articles and problems.

## **POST COURSE ASSESSMENT**

---

Given the goals of this course, anonymous student comments are useful for evaluating the course both in terms of thematic set-up and pedagogical approach. Overall, students had very positive reviews of both the theoretical component and pedagogical approach of the course. From a theoretical perspective, one student commented that the course allowed him/her to "voice and hear new opinions that are more difficult to hear in other INTL [international affairs] courses." Given that global security policy is both critiquing and creating new themes in international relations, this was a particularly encouraging comment taken in conjunction with multiple students saying that the course offered "new ideas" and stimulated interest in the subject matter. Moreover, one student said that the approach to

global security "challenged traditions [in] IR [international relations] thinking with a futuristic approach rather than focusing on the past." Global security policy as a subfield seeks to challenge traditional paradigms, and this comment reflected the course objectives.

In terms of pedagogical approach, students gave high praise for the classroom environment and said that discussion and "facilitation skills are an example for others to follow" and that the activities "really kept me engaged." Along similar lines, another student said that the "group work and discussion was highly effective." When looking at quantitative assessment of course outcomes, the overall rating for the course in terms of assignments, activities, course organization, and other similar measures was 4.46 out of 5.00. The praise in these comments and overall ratings suggest that the course fulfilled many of its objectives, including encouraging students to be comfortable making arguments in a classroom setting, framing policy problems in new light, and connecting themes to current events.

---

#### Bibliography

- Agarwal-Rangnath, Ruchi. 2013. *Social Studies, Literacy, and Social Justice in the Common Core Classroom*. New York: Teacher's College.
- Ayers, William and Ryan Alexander-Tanner. 2010. *To Teach: The Journey, in Comics*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dolby, Nadine. 2003. Popular culture and democratic practice. *Harvard Educational Review* 73(3): 258.
- Mobley, Kayce and Sarah Fisher. 2014. Ditching the Desks: Kinesthetic Learning in College Classrooms. *The Social Studies* 105 (6): 301-309.
- Rubin, Beth C. 2012. *Making Citizens: Transforming Civil Learning for Diverse Social Studies Classrooms*. New York: Routledge.
- Wendt, Alexander E. 1987. The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory. *International Organizations* 41(3): 335-370.