International Security Studies is a seminar devoted to the security studies subfield of international relations. The primary audience is political science graduate students intending to take the qualifying exam and/or write a 591 paper dealing with security issues. Graduate students from other departments and advanced undergraduates with adequate preparation may be admitted to the course with permission from the instructor.

The course has three main objectives:

1. To understand the major theoretical perspectives in security studies and the challenges to providing reliable evidence for or against them.

2. To survey some of the most important substantive areas and debates in the field with an emphasis on recent contributions and tying academic research on security-related issues to policy.

3. To help students initiate one or more of their own research projects so they gain practical experience in elaborating a theoretical argument, drawing out testable implications, assembling and analyzing relevant evidence, and presenting the work. For some students this may entail producing a first draft of a 591 paper.

Goals 2 and 3 necessarily constrain our ability to cover the entire subfield. They also mean we will spend less time reading some of the classics than in other courses. We can spend part of our last class session developing a reading list of classics if desired. For summaries of the current security literature students should review appendix B which is current through 2010 or consult Jack Levy’s remarkable syllabus which is current through 2015 (124 pages!):

Course Requirements:

1. Class participation.
2. Paper presentations (30%). Each week two students will present. They will each be responsible for giving one of the papers we have read for that week. The presentation should walk the class through the logic of the paper, describe the magnitude and significance of the effects (either by calculating for papers with statistics or by answering the “compared to what?” question for qualitative papers) and/or importance of the theoretical point, and articulate what you understand the paper’s contribution to be. The last means you’ll need to do some citation mapping and skimming outside of the assigned readings. Work with replication data is also encouraged. Papers to be presented each week are noted below.

3. Two 5-7 page research designs (35% each). Each of which should lay out a plan for analyzing a key theoretical or empirical issue in security. The research designs should include:
   a. A clear and succinct statement of a theoretical argument on an important question that you extract from the literature or develop yourself.
   b. A characterization of the population of cases to which the theoretical argument/hypotheses apply, and the description of a sample (or way of sampling) from this population.
      * If it’s a theoretical proposal this section must lay out the contribution you expect to make and what paradigm you want to work in (game theory, ABM, systems dynamics, verbal theory, etc.).
      * If it’s an empirical proposal, this section must define how you plan to make inferentially credible claims, either detailing an identification strategy or outlining how your theory implies a set of observable relationships that are inconsistent with competing arguments.
   c. A preliminary assessment or “plausibility probe” based on brief examination of one or more cases from a sample, or a “quick” coding of variables for a simple descriptive analysis or reduce-form regressions.

4. Research presentations. In the final week students will present one of their papers and receive feedback from the class.

I will not allow incompletes in this course, so plan accordingly. Grades will be based on paper presentations (30%) and research proposals (35% each). I will use class participation as a heuristic for moving people up or down by as much as a half-grade at the end of the course. All assignments must be turned in by 5 p.m. on January 17 and no late papers will be accepted under any circumstances. Papers turned in by 5 p.m. on December 17 will receive more detailed feedback.

Readings:

You may notice that some weeks have an awful lot to read. That’s intentional, grad school is like exercise, the more it hurts the stronger it makes you. There are many potential questions to ask of any given reading (appendix A provides guidance on how to think about papers when you review them for journals and has a pretty exhaustive list), but I usually take my notes in 5 sections:
1. **Question.** This is straightforward, what’s the question they are trying to answer. Think of this as the author’s answer for why you should spend some of your precious limited time on this planet reading their research.

2. **Key DV.** How do they operationalize the key concept? If you’re studying democratization, and you put Polity score on the LHS of a regression, then your DV is Polity scores.

3. **Claims.** Which IV matter? In empirical papers this is usually about which IV influence the DV and the outcome for which it proxies. In theoretical papers this can be more subtle. It could be, for example, about what the causal processes that are consistent with both observed outcomes and some set of assumptions about how people make decisions.

4. **Evidence.** What’s the evidence they adduce for the argument? For empirical papers this should include: (b) the nature of the data; (b) claims re. identification/how they establish the counterfactual; and (c) what, if anything, they say about external validity. For theoretical papers this is usually some set of linked logical claims, whether expressed mathematically or verbally.

5. **Discussion.** Do you buy it? If not why not? If so, is it important?

I have not ordered books since they can be purchased online, usually at lower prices. If you want something put on reserve at Firestone Library just ask. Articles can be downloaded and those which cannot will be available on Blackboard or library e-reserves.

As a security scholar you should have the following in your library:


Some extremely useful things to be familiar with if you want to think seriously about security issues and how we can develop reliable knowledge about social phenomena:


And if you want to work with data for a living, you should absolutely read Edward Tufte’s four books:

• *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*

• *Envisioning Information*

• *Visual Explanations: Images and Quantities, Evidence and Narrative*

• *Beautiful Information*

**Schedule and Assignments:**

Most weeks we will focus on substantive questions, e.g., ‘why do wars happen?’ We will spend one week on methods at the start of the course. Students will present research papers during the final week of the course.

**Paper Assignments - TBD**

Week 2:
Week 3:
Week 4:
Week 5: N/A Yom Kippur
Week 6:
Week 7:
Week 8:
Week 9:
Week 10:

**Course Organization**

The course is divided into two sections. Weeks 2-6 will cover some topics you just need to get a handle on, including: methods in security (not the normal ones…); where the frontier is in empirical work on conflict; why wars happen; and two cuts on the role of domestic politics. Weeks 7-10 will be chosen by you guys from the following options. Weeks 11 and 12 will be student presentations given the size of the class. I have put past readings in weeks 7-11 to give you a sense of the kinds of substantive weeks we have had:

- Proliferation
- Insurgency and civil war
- Aid and conflict
- Elections and violence
- Endogenously ungoverned spaces
- Experiments in security
- Strategic culture
- The resource curse
- Working with proxies
- Religion and conflict

**Week 1 (9/14): Methods in Security (and other fields).** Students will coordinate to assign response papers and syllabi input at the end class. Readings listed below for the week are recommended.

**Required readings**


c. A smorgasbord on ML and social science, including:
   i. [http://stanford.edu/~jgrimmer/bd_2.pdf](http://stanford.edu/~jgrimmer/bd_2.pdf)
   iii. [http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~hal/Papers/2013/ml.pdf](http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~hal/Papers/2013/ml.pdf)

**Recommended Readings**

1. How do we make inferences about the world

2. Rational choice?

3. Thinking clearly about causation and external validity

4. A case study:

**Week 2 (9/21): Work from the Empirical Frontier (CLASS TO START EARLY)**

Students to present readings 1 and 2.

**Week 3 (9/28): Why Do Wars Happen?**

1. Game Theoretic Accounts
2. Traditional Rationalist Accounts – Student to present these three as a package

3. A Syncretic View – Student to present  

**Recommended Reading:**

**Week 4 (10/5): Domestic Politics and Interstate War Part I: Are Democracies Different?**

1. Democratic Peace – Student to present Cederman  

2. Domestic Institutions and Military Power – Student to present Schultz & Weingast, Stasavage, and Scheve & Stasavage as a package.  
Week 5 (10/12): No Class, Yom Kippur

Week 6 (10/19): Domestic Politics and Interstate War Part II: Decision Making and Bureaucracy

1. Domestic Politics and Foreign policy decision-making. Student to present on Kaufman and Pape.


2. Bureaucracy. Student to present on Hammong and Bendor and Hammond.

3. And some amazing stories of organizational/bureaucratic happenstance:
   a. [http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/oct/27/vasili-arkhipov-stopped-nuclear-war](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/oct/27/vasili-arkhipov-stopped-nuclear-war)

Week 7 (10/26): Experiments in Security

1. Milner and co. Uganda experiments on foreign aid, as below
   a. Multilateral vs. bilateral:
   b. Impact on political feedback cycles
      [http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/working%20papers/WhichDevilInDevelopment.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~hmilner/working%20papers/WhichDevilInDevelopment.pdf)

2. Experiments and IR

3. What should we make of experiments, some examples from economics

3. Development research with security implications (2nd two to be skimmed, read Callen and Long):

Week 8 (11/9): Aid and Conflict


Week 9 (11/16): Transnational Crime

5. Additional article TBD, possibly piracy
6. Additional article TBD, possibly gang conflict

Week 10 (11/30): Topic TBD – Below is last year’s on space security
   http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00396330701564752#.VNk7k9LF_Z0

Week 11 (12/7): Civil War, Insurgency, and Terrorism


Recommended:


**Weeks 11 and 12 (12/7 and 12/14): Student Presentations**

13 Class Presentations:
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. 
11. 
12. 
13.
Appendix A: How to Read and Review an Academic Paper

These comments apply best to quantitative empirical papers, but are also applicable to formal theory and qualitative or comparative works. They draw on my experiences, a checklist by Chris Blattman (who draws on similar checklists from Alain de Janvry, Elisabeth Sadoulet, and Macartan Humphreys), and the nice review pieces by Miller et. al. (2013).

A good review should be separated into two sections. Put your recommendation on the disposition of the paper into your confidential comments to the editor with a one or two sentence explanation why. Make the comments to the author constructive and useful, regardless of what you think should be done with the paper.

General strategies

Treat reviews with the respect you would want your own work to receive. A review report for a serious article being considered for a top journal could take you a serious amount of time, such as a day.

Reviews vary in length a great deal. Two to four pages of comments are customary, longer is reasonable if the article is likely to be exceptionally important but needs substantial revision. Shorter reviews would be acceptable for clear “accept” or clear “reject” cases, though you should be able to generate detailed comments on even the best papers (or help out the worst ones).

Reviews should be courteous and professional. Think of how you would like to be treated. Do not be insulting or devastating. Do not be sarcastic, cruel, mocking, haughty or dismissive. Frame your critiques constructively whenever possible. Even if you are recommending rejection, you do the editors and authors a favor by explaining how they could address the concern in the current work (or, as a last resort, future work).

Be clear about what you see as the central and important issues, and put this material at the beginning. Use sub-points or a later section for points of moderate importance. Cluster small comments and quibbles, or minor corrections you see, as the very end. Do not force the editor to read the entire review to get the main points. Your critiques should be thorough and persuasive. A gut feeling that something is wrong is not enough. Do the work to figure out whether your instincts are correct or not.

Remember, if the paper is good you have a responsibility to the authors to give the editor reasons to accept it. If the paper is bad you have a responsibility to the field and to science to make sure it is not published, at least not until the problems are fixed.

Do not hold a paper up with suggestions for extensions unless they are critical to the central contribution of the paper. Let the authors decide, it’s their paper.

Research question and hypothesis

- Is the researcher focused on well-defined questions?
- Are the questions interesting and important?
• Are the propositions falsifiable?
• Have alternative hypotheses been clearly stated?

Substantive importance
• How does the paper inform the profession or the subfield more broadly? Did the argument, method or result change how you think about a broadly important question or issue?
• What is the most general application of this finding? Has the author made that case clearly and persuasively?
• If the question and issue is fairly specialized, is a major contribution in this sub field (or sub sub field) sufficiently important?
• Is there real-world importance of the issue? Is this something people making policy should know?

Theory/Model
• Does the theory clarify some pre-existing uncertainty? Secondarily, is anything about the theory novel or surprising? Be careful here, what may seem second nature to you after reading a really nice theoretical argument likely did not immediately beforehand.
• Is the idea being presented simple and self-evident enough that a formal or detailed treatment of the theory is not required, or could a more formal treatment be useful in the main body or an appendix?
• Is the theory/model clear, insightful, and appropriate?
• Could the theory benefit from being more explicit, developed, or formal? Could it benefit from being simpler and less formal?
• Are there clear predictions that can be falsified? Are these predictions “risky” enough? Does the theory generate any prohibitions that can be tested?
• How are the theories’ predictions different from simpler alternatives? Are those differences important and testable?
• Could there be alternative models that produce similar predictions—that is, does evidence on the predictions necessarily weigh on the model or explanation?
• Does the theory rely on substantively reasonable assumptions and have those been validated in some way?
• Is the theory actually a theory, or a just list of predictions?
• Does it feel like the theory was derived after the results, moved to the front of the paper, and then “tested” with data?
• Is the theory consistent with past literature and findings?
• Are elements that are excluded or simplified plausibly unimportant for the outcomes?
• Is the theory general or specific? Are there more general theories on which this theory could draw or contribute?

Empirical strategy (from theory to hypotheses and tests)
• Is the empirical strategy related to or derived from the theory?
  ○ Are predictions simply stated or are they derived logically?
• Is the theory needed to generate the hypotheses? Would other theories do so as well?
• Does the theory generate more hypotheses than considered?
• Does the theory suggest heterogeneous effects?
• Have all the relevant predictions and empirical strategies been employed?
  o Does the paper ignore important descriptive analysis in favor of a jump to causal inference?
  o Are there pieces of evidence (patterns, levels, etc) that would support the theoretical approach?
  o Are there assumptions made in the theory that have not been tested or articulated?
• Is the approach inductive, deductive, or an exercise in data mining? Is this the right structure?
• Could the question be addressed with another approach?
• Does the theory suggest heterogeneous effects?
• Do the tests match the theory in that concepts in the theory are well-represented by the measures that author is using.

Data and measures
• Are the data clearly described?
  o Summary statistics
  o Clear statement of sources
  o Could you replicate what they did
• Is the choice of data well-suited to the question and test?
• Could the data sources or collection method be biased?
  o Is collection of key variables likely to be correlated in any way with outcomes? What about treatment status?
  o Are there any worrying sources of measurement error or missing data?
  o Have the authors described the consequences of any data problems for their inferences (e.g. magnitude and direction of bias)
• Are there sample size or power issues?
• Are there better sources of data that you would recommend?
• Are there types of data that should have been reported, or would have been useful or essential in the empirical analysis?

Measurement
• Do they provide details of the measurement and construction of major variables
• Do the measures capture the objects specified by the theory? Are any proxies reasonable?
• If the data are from other sources, have they established the credibility of those sources or given evidence that they know enough about them to be sure the data are of high quality?
• If the data are from surveys, have they described enough of the survey procedures to provide evidence of quality?

Causal identification and internal validity
• Is the “cause” clear? Is there a cause/treatment/program/fist stage?
• Is the specific method and counterfactual clearly defined? Is it compelling?
• Is the method for identifying the causal effect clear and compelling? Has statistical inference been confused with causal inference?
• Does the research design identify a very narrow or a very general source of variation?
• Does the analysis conform with the “latest technology” for that particular method?
• Useful trick: ask yourself, “What experiment would someone run to answer this question?”
• Did the author make any assumptions for identification (e.g. of distributions, exogeneity, etc)? Were these assumptions tested and, if not, how would you test them?
• Some specific things to look out for:
  o Does the argument for exogeneity of treatment draw on knowledge of the treatment, or do they simply throw in standard panel data controls without justification?
  o Is there selection not just in who receives the “treatment”, but in who we observe, or who we measure?
  o Could differencing, or the use of fixed effects, exacerbate any measurement error?
  o Are there concerns of attenuation bias or systematic measurement bias from measurement error?
  o Are there concerns of reverse causality?
  o Are there concerns of omitted variables?
  o If using instruments, have they clearly discussed plausibility of exogeneity, exclusion restrictions and strength? Has the instrument been used previously to test a different causal relationship? If so there’s an issue there for the exclusion restriction.
  o Is matching confused with a solution for unobservable selection?
  o Does their argument for identification have testable ancillary predictions and if so do they check them?

Other aspects of empirical analysis
• Are the statistical techniques well suited to the problem at hand? Is the empirical model used consistent with the theory?
• What are the endogenous and exogenous variables? Is it clear?
• Has the paper adequately dealt with concerns about measurement error, simultaneity, omitted variables, selection, and other forms of bias and identification problems?
• Are the results demonstrated to be robust to alternative assumptions? How complete and persuasive are these robustness tests?
• Is the depth of robustness checks consistent with the seriousness of the issue at hand?
• Have they shown you where the results break and discussed what that tells us about the internal and external validity of the analysis.
• Does the disturbance term have an interpretation, or is it just tacked on?
• Are the observations i.i.d., and if not, have corrections to the standard errors been made? Have they discussed how standard errors are calculated.
• What additional tests of the empirical strategy would you suggest for robustness and confidence in the research strategy?
• Are there any dangers in the empirical strategy (e.g. sensitivity to identification assumptions)?
• Can you imagine a better, or alternative, empirical strategy?
• Look at the “not significant” effects: are they substantively large? Do the confidence intervals include very large effects?

Results
• Are the results presented in an intuitive and clear way? Could this be improved?
• Do the authors do the simplest thing that makes the point or do they use unnecessarily complicated methods?
• Is substantive significance of results clearly explained and discussed, or is the focus merely on statistical significance?
• Do the results adequately answer the question at hand?
• Are the conclusions convincing? Are appropriate caveats mentioned?
• What variation in the data identifies the elements of the model?
• Are there alternative explanations for the results, and can we test for them? Do the results admit rival interpretations? If so is this important/acknowledged.
• Could the author have taken the analysis further, to look for impact heterogeneity, for causal mechanisms, for effects on other variables, etc?
• Is absence of evidence confused with evidence of absence?

Scope and external validity
• Can we generalize these results?
• Is the population examined representative of the larger population of interest? If not are the implications of the findings different than what the authors say?
• Has the author specified the scope conditions?
• Are the conditions under which the relationship of interest is examined consistent with the conditions of interest for other scholars or policy makers?
• Have casual mechanisms been explored?
• Are there further types of analysis that would illuminate the external validity, or the causal mechanism at work?
• Are there other data or approaches that would complement the current one?
• Do any policy implications really follow from the results?

General organization
• Has the study been presented in a way that it can be replicated?
• Is the paper laid out logically and follow, to some degree, the scientific method?
• If empirical, are there clear and logically ordered sections for theory, empirical strategy, data, measurement, results, etc.? If theoretical, do the authors lay out clearly the players and structure of the interaction, their utility functions, the resulting best responses, and then characterize the equilibrium of interest and its substantively important comparative statics?
For other weeks
5. Include Laura and Gaurav’s paper on insurgency in India
6. Add Berman et. al. piece on taxation and conflict in the PI
7.

Appendix B: The Literature through 2010 per Downes, Krebs, etc.. Needs to be updated, maybe by someone studying for comps!

Neorealism, Defensive Realism, and Offense-Defense Theory

Recommended Advocates:
- Andrew H. Kydd, Trust and Mistrust in International Relations (Princeton, 2005).


  ❖ Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, “Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity,” *IO* 44/2 (Spring 1990): 137-68.


Recommended Critiques:


• Peter D. Feaver, et al., “Correspondence: Brother Can You Spare a Paradigm? (Or Was Anybody Ever a Realist?),” *ISR* 25/1 (Summer 2000): 165-93.

  ❖ Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” *ISR* 24/2 (Fall 1999): 5-55.


• Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge, 1999).


Dan Reiter, “Exploding the Powder Keg Myth: Preemptive Wars Almost Never Happen,” IS 20/2 (Fall 1995): 5-34.


Recommended, “Neoclassical” Realism:

- Randall L. Schweller, Deadly Imbalances: Tripolarity and Hitler’s Strategy of World Conquest (Columbia, 1998).

Offensive Realism

Recommended Advocates:


Recommended Critiques:


Democratic Peace

The Basic Debate:

Brown, Lynn-Jones, and Miller, eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace*:

• Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, “Democratization and the Danger of War,” 301-34.

Recommended, General:
• Zeev Maoz, “The Controversy over the Democratic Peace: Rearguard Action or Cracks in the Wall?” *IS* 22/1 (Summer 1997): 162-98.

Recommended, Norms:


**Recommended, Institutions:**


**Recommended Extensions:**


**Recommended Critiques:**


**Institutions**


**Interdependence**


• Katherine Barbieri, “Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict?” *JCR* 33/1 (February 1996): 29-49.

**Norms, Culture, and Force**

Prominent Pieces:

Recommended:


• Martha Finnemore, *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force* (Cornell, 2003).


Recommended Critiques:


**Bargaining, Crisis Bargaining, and War**

Core Readings:


Recommended:


**Shifting Power and War**

**Core Readings:**


**Recommended:**


Coercion/Compellence

Core Readings:
• Thomas C. Schelling, Arms and Influence (Yale, 1966), 1-125, 166-89.

Recommended:
• Daniel Byman and Matthew Waxman, The Dynamics of Coercion: American Foreign Policy and the Limits of Military Might (Cambridge, 2002).

**Reputation and Deterrence**

**Core Readings:**
- Todd Sechser, “Goliath’s Curse: Asymmetric Power and the Effectiveness of Coercive Threats” (unpub. ms., University of Virginia; Blackboard).

**Reputation:**

Deterrence, General:
• Alexander George and Richard Smoke, Deterrence in American Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice (Columbia, 1974).

Nuclear Deterrence:
• Nina Tannenwald, The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons Since 1945 (Cambridge, 2008).

Nuclear Proliferation, Causes and Consequences:


**Deterrence Debates:**


**Military Effectiveness I: Democracy and Victory**

**Core Readings:**

- Responses to Desch by Choi, Lake, and Reiter and Stam; and Desch’s reply, *IS* 28/1 (Summer 2003): 142-94.

**Recommended:**

**Recommended Critiques:**

**Military Effectiveness II: Force Employment and Other Explanations**

**Core Readings:**


Recommended:


❖ Responses to Biddle by Daryl G. Press, Thomas A. Keaney, and Thomas A. Mahnken and Barry D. Watts, and Biddle’s rejoinder, in *IS* 22/2 (Fall 1997): 137-74.


War Termination

Core Readings:


Recommended:


War Termination, The Cold War:

FURTHER TOPICS AND DEBATES IN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Balancing After the Cold War/Soft Balancing

What is the structure of the international system? Is it stable? Is “soft” balancing against the U.S. emerging? If so, how can the U.S. avoid it?


Terrorism

This previously neglected field has moved into the mainstream since 9/11. This is an introduction to some of the academic literature.


Robert Trager and Dessislava Zagorceva, “Deterring Terrorism: It Can Be Done,” *IS* 30/3 (Winter 2005/06): 87-123.


Mia Bloom, *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror* (Columbia, 2004).

Marc Sageman, *Understanding Terror Networks* (UPenn, 2004).

Daniel L. Byman, “Al-Qaeda as an Adversary: Do We Understand Our Enemy?” *WP* 56/1 (October 2003): 139-63.


### Grand Strategy

There was a big debate in the 1990s over what grand strategy the U.S. should adopt in the wake of the Soviet Union’s collapse. The Brown (1997) volume contains many of the important contributions. Art (2003) is a book-length statement of “selective engagement,” and Layne (2006) is the same for “offshore balancing.” This debate fell by the wayside to some degree after 9/11, as it became the conventional wisdom that the U.S. had to take the fight to the terrorists abroad.

IR Perspectives on Ethnic Conflict, Civil War, Intervention, Occupation, and Peacekeeping

This is by no means intended to be a comprehensive guide to the literature on these subjects, especially ethnic conflict and civil war. It is merely an introduction to some of the IR-influenced literature.

- David M. Edelstein, Occupational Hazards: Success and Failure in Military Occupation (Cornell, 2008).


Barbara F. Walter and Jack Snyder, eds., *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention* (Columbia, 1999).


**The First Image and War**


**Domestic Politics and War**

Core Readings:


Recommended, Diversionary War:


Recommended, Bureaucratic Politics and Organization Theory:


• Stephen Krasner, “Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison Wonderland),” *FP* 7 (Summer 1972): 159-79.

Civil-Military Relations


Public Opinion, Casualties, and the Use of Force


   Christopher Gelpi, Jason Reifler, and Peter D. Feaver, “Iraq the Vote: Retrospective and Prospective Foreign Policy Judgments, Candidate Choice, and Casualty Tolerance,” *Political Behavior* 29/2 (June 2007): 151-74.


Steven Kull and I.M. Destler, Misreading the Public: The Myth of a New Isolationism (Brookings, 1999).


The Environment and Security

