Political Science 385
International Security
Summer 2022
Bill Newmann
This course counts for the International Relations concentration in the POLI major

Office Hours: This is an online course, so there will be no office hours. However, e-mail as often as you like (**wnewmann@vcu.edu**)**.** We can also set up zoom appointments or real life appointments in my office (318 Founders Hall); just ask.

Here is a **link to my home page** with links to other syllab (This will be fixed soon)

Introduction:

This course is an online course. You'll read five books and write five analytical reviews. All papers should be submitted through regular old e-mail or through Canvas email. All papers will be returned with comments through e-mail as well. There will be no class meetings. A full assignment-by-assignment schedule is at the end of the syllabus.

The Books

The following books are available at the Virginia Book Company (Franklin and Shafer St.), the VCU Bookstore, and Bookholders. Some will be on reserve at Cabell Library circulation desk (as indicated below). They will be on three day reserve.

- John Mearsheimer. *The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019). On reserve: D443 .M43 2018; ISBN 978-0300248562; Available online in VCU Libraries;
- Graham Allison. *Destined for War: Can America and China Escape the Thucydides Trap?* (NY: Mariner Books, 2018) ISBN 978-1328915382; Available online in VCU Libraries;
- Robert Jervis. *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989) On reserve: U263 .J47 1989; ISBN 978-0801495656;
- Paul Collier. *The Plundered Planet: Why We Must--and How We Can--Manage Nature for Global Prosperity* (Oxford University Press, 2011) Not available at VCU libraries; ISBN 978-0195395242;
- Kathryn Sikkink. *Evidence for Hope: Making Human Rights Work in the 21st Century* (Princeton University Press, 2019). On reserve at VCU Libraries JC571 .S55 2017 ISBN 978-0691192710.

This course is an introduction to some of the basic concepts in international security. We'll trace the definition of international security, and how it has evolved during the 20th and 21st centuries. Your readings take you through that evolution. Traditional international security focused on the interactions between nation-states – great power rivalry, war, the fate of weak states trying to navigate between the great powers, and the impact of nuclear weapons and other technologies (The Mearsheimer, Allison, and Jervis books). By the turn of the century scholars and policy makers were arguing that a set of new issues were threatening international peace and security – the impact that war, poverty, rapid economic change, migration, infectious disease, and unstable or dictatorial government have on the

average person and on local communities. The new concept shifted the focus of international security away from nation-states and onto individuals. Poverty, climate change, and resource problems have been seen by some scholars as the biggest threats to international security, the problems that will impact everyone and every aspect of our lives in the future (The Collier book). The most basic aspect of this approach is how individuals themselves are treated by governments and how they might be able to survive the tragedies of war, dictatorial governments, and ethnic/racial hatred. In short this aspect of international security is the agenda for human rights (The Sikkink book).

I mentioned that each book will be an analytical review. What does that mean? There is a lot of detail on that below, but here is the short version.

- The author is making an argument. What do you think? Half your paper should summarize the author's argument and half the paper should be your response. I've tried to pick books that have a clear and forceful argument.

Your initial papers may be rocky, but I am looking for your effort and indications that you are learning. Early difficulty will be overshadowed by the quality of your papers at the end of the course. Your grade will reflect the improvement. In other words, put the grade aspect aside for the moment and learn. What you have learned and your level of effort will be reflected in your final grade. So, don't be discouraged if your early grades aren't what you had hoped.

Learning Outcomes

1. Students will achieve comprehension of and be able to assess the theoretical paradigms of international relations and international security, particularly realism, idealism/liberalism, constructivism, and nationalism
2. Students will be able to identify and evaluate the challenges of traditional international security, such as great power rivalry, the use of force, intervention as a tool of foreign policy, the impact of technological change, and the way in which great power conflict has shaped the international system.
3. Students will be able to identify and evaluate the challenges of modern international security, such as the threats of terrorism, nuclear proliferation, climate change, human rights, and ethnic conflict
4. Students will be able to evaluate the differences between traditional and modern views of international security.
5. Students will be able to evaluate the national and international strategies designed to deal with international security challenges
6. Students will demonstrate the ability to review seminal works on international security, and analyze these works in short papers.

A Short Intro to the Books

- The Mearsheimer book is a classic, one of the seminal texts about great power politics and rivalries between nations. It's from the dominant realist paradigm -- international politics is about power. Period. Mearsheimer's realism is called offensive realism -- great powers don't just compete with each other; they strive for hegemony (dominance/leadership), working to

maximize their power and expand their advantage over every other state. Mearsheimer has written several classics. This particular book examines the US hopes to create a liberal world (liberal hegemony) after the end of the Cold War, a world based on rules rooted in democracy, human rights as defined by the US, and peaceful cooperation between nation states. Mearsheimer believes that the US ignored basic realities of international politics. He contrasts liberal ideas with those of realism and nationalism. He is not very optimistic about peace in the world, believing that liberal hegemony was doomed from the start because. Geopolitical rivalries (realism) are permanent features of the world and no rules based system can change that. The allegiances individuals have to their own nations (nationalism) are stronger than any international rules or calls for international cooperation; in short, we are Americans, Russians, Chinese, or Indians before we are citizens of a liberal world community.

- The Allison book examines one of the dilemmas presented by Mearsheimer: are great powers destined to battle each other for supremacy? Are the US and China destined for war? The book looks at some theory and a lot of history, and tries to set out ways for the US and China to avoid war. The simple premise is this one. The US is the most powerful nation on the planet right now, the reigning hegemon (global leader) since 1945, but it seems to be fading in both power and authority. China is the rising challenger. If history tells us anything about great power rivalries, it is that rising challengers aspire to be hegemon and that fading hegemons do not want to give up the throne. The "Thucydides Trap" of the title refers to the historian Thucydides' explanation of the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BCE). Short and simple, he wrote: "It was the rise of Athens and the fear that this instilled in Sparta that made war inevitable." His book proceeds from there, asking this question: Will it be the rise of China and the fear that this instilled in the US that made war inevitable?

- The Jervis book examines the impact of nuclear weapons on international security. It is also a classic. It was written during the cold war, which gives it the perspective of the real possibility that the US and USSR might annihilate each other off the planet with nuclear weapons at any moment. Jervis' argument is that nuclear weapons have fundamentally changed the nature of war and therefore great power relations. Nuclear war cannot be won, and therefore it will not be fought; decision makers are rational and will not choose to fight a nuclear war. Rivalries between great powers will continue, but there is an upper limit to the antagonism. Everyone understands that nuclear war means the end of all things. Jervis' essential argument is that the most horrific weapons created in the 20th century will lead to a relatively peaceful world. The idea stands in contrast to theories suggesting nuclear weapons are like any other weapons; they can be used for political advantage, and limited nuclear war (the selective use of nuclear strikes against military and civilian targets) can lead to victory in a great power war.

- The Collier book moves on to a very different range of issues: poverty, natural resources, and climate change. The book picks up where some of Collier's other works left off. In a book called *The Bottom Billion*, Collier noted that the world was experiencing amazing prosperity for the past 40 years or so (life expectancy up, infant mortality down, incomes up, education levels up, access to critical nutrition up, number of wars down; women's access to education and equality increasing). Though it doesn't sound like that description is true if you go on the internet or watch the news, these are all true. The problem, Collier argued, is that for about a billion people (the bottom billion), everything is worse. They are being left behind. That

explains why things are getting better for most people even while inequality is increasing. *The Plundered Planet* is Collier's analysis of how things just might get worse for everyone if we don't pay attention. If we don't manage our natural resources well, if we don't get serious about climate change, if we don't deal with the horrendous poverty that still does exist, the positive trends of the last forty years will be reversed.

- Sikkink's books are an optimistic turn. Again, when we go online and read about the state of the world, it seems all bad news. Sikkink makes the argument that a decades-long push for human rights has been more successful than people realize. The efforts by governments, international organizations, and individuals to improve the lives of people throughout the world has changed millions of lives. More people have freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of the press, the ability to vote, access to education, and rights to marry, have a job, and simply exist in spite of the myriad ways people have faced discrimination in the past. Sikkink isn't arguing that discrimination and gross violations of human rights don't still exist, but she is arguing that real improvements have been made, and those successes can point to ways that we can continue to improve the human rights of people around the world.

The point of this class is for you to understand the author's arguments and analyze. Feel free to agree or disagree. My point of view on these books is irrelevant. I am equally comfortable with analyses that include phrases like "This is brilliant" or "This is a pile of stinking garbage." You just need to explain why you think the way you do.

The schedule for the class is at the end of the syllabus.

Basic Requirements

Papers You will be writing five papers.

- The papers should be 5 full pages at minimum -- 5-6 pages is the target. More than five full pages is no problem. I'll read as much as you want to write; if you are very interested in a subject and want to play around with the ideas for more than five pages, then I am very happy; enjoy yourself and I will enjoy your enthusiasm and ideas. But fewer than five full pages would lead to a significant point deduction.

Deadlines

- You'll have about ten days to read a book and write a paper.
- All papers are to be submitted over email at midnight of the date the paper is due, so if the paper is due June 17, that means midnight June 17 as June 17 becomes June 18. These are soft deadlines, which means you have wiggle room. Shoot for midnight and if you email it to me in the middle of the night, it's not a problem. But if it comes after about 6:00 AM the next day, then it will be late.
- Late penalties are ten points per day.
- Of course, if you're dealing with some medical or family/personal crisis, talk to me. In that case, I'll give you an extension.
- Specific deadlines are in the schedule below.

Margins, Spacing, Font

- Papers should be doubled-spaced with one-inch margins, and 11 or 12 point font. Shorter pages with wide margins and large print size font will be penalized

My Comments

- I will make comments on your paper and email that version back to you. If you have questions, we can email back and forth as often as you like or set up a zoom. I will try to mark up your papers pretty heavily with grammar, substance, and devil's advocacy, but the grade will reflect the substance.
- I will get your papers back to you before the next paper is due, so that you can use my comments to improve your next paper.

Revision

- You'll be required to rewrite one of your papers based on my comments. This is a requirement, but it is also an opportunity. If you're unhappy with a grade, you get the chance to fix a paper. Any one of the papers can be chosen for a rewrite except the last paper. Use my comments on the paper to rework the paper and improve your grade. Also, there is a nice loophole built in here. Let's say you got swamped with work from other classes or a job you have. You can't get the paper in on time. Maybe you need two more days. I can't give you an extension unless its health or family/personal, but if you hand in half a paper or even a sentence that says "here is my paper," that can be the paper you rewrite. Rewrites are due the same day as the final paper, but you can turn them in at any time you like.

Grades

- Each paper is worth 18% of the grade; that adds up to 90%. What about the other 10%? We're still dealing with a once in a century health crisis, so I'm building some wiggle room into the class. It is, after all, a 15 week course squeezed into 8 weeks. First, you get a revision of one paper; that's nice. Also, I'm leaving that extra 10% as a bonus for your grade. That 10% score will be based on the highest grade you receive on any paper in the class. If your highest grade is a 92 on paper four, for example, then your 10% bonus is 10% of 92. The percentages for each paper are as follows.
    - Paper One: 18%
    - Paper Two: 18%
    - Paper Three: 18%
    - Paper Four: 18%
    - Paper Five: 18%
    - Bonus: 10%
- How to calculate your grade: Use the percentages from above. So, if you received the following grades, you would calculate your grades in the following manner:
    - Paper 1: 91, at 18% of the grade, that's 90 multiplied by .18 = 16.38
    - Paper 2: 90, at 18% of the grade, that's 90 multiplied by .18 = 16.2
    - Paper 3: 88, at 18% of the grade, that's 88 multiplied by .18 = 15.84

- Paper 4: 92, at 18% of the grade, that's 92 multiplied by .18 = 16.56
- Paper 5: 88, at 18% of the grade, that's 90 multiplied by .18 = 15.84
- Bonus: 92 at 10% of the grade, that's 92 multiplied by .10 = 9.2
- To get your final grade add all the scores: 16.38 + 16.2 + 15.84 + 16.56 + 15.84 + 9.2 = 90.02. Congratulations, you got an A. That bonus out you over the top!

Grading scale

- I use a typical scale: A = 90-100; B = 80-89; C = 70-79; D = 55-69.
- I have standard borderline grade policies that I use in all my syllabi, but this class is a little bit different because it is eight weeks and because it is all writing. The point is to learn and that means that while your first papers may not be as solid as you want, improvement will be rewarded. I'm more interested in what your work is like at the end of the semester than at the beginning. Your grade will reflect that.
- There is no extra credit for this class. Please do not ask.

The Papers

I base the grade on several things:

1. Introductory paragraph
2. Organization of the paper
3. Analysis of the author's argument
4. Command of the supporting evidence the author introduces
5. Your argument and ideas

In your paper, please do not simply summarize the book. Your paper should be 50% summary and 50% your ideas – critical comments on the author's ideas and argument. When I say critical, I don't mean that you have to disagree with the author. I mean that you should assess the author's argument in terms of:

1. Consistency (are there big contradiction*s* in the author's argument?)
2. Logic (does the argument make sense to you?),
3. Supporting evidence (does the author's evidence support the theory?)
4. Accuracy (does the author's argument seem realistic given what you know about the world. If so, why? If not, why not?)
5. Focus on the concepts and ideas, not on the writing style

Be creative. If you want to redesign the author's theories and arguments, go ahead. What are your ideas on the subject? What is the author missing? Where does the argument miss the point? What are the logical conclusions of the author's arguments and your ideas?

On Writing a Good Analytical Paper

1. Make an argument in the paper. Do you agree or disagree with the author, and why? Does the author get the answer to his question right, but uses faulty evidence? Does he provide strong evidence, but get the answer wrong? Is the author even asking the correct question? I'm interested in your opinions of the issue and the way you backup your analysis. You can summarize the author's argument as you analyze it. Remember what the purpose of your paper is. It is not a summary of the author's argument. It is an analytical examination of the author's argument and the issue the author is addressing. I want to know what you think. I know what the author thinks. I read the book. I don't know what you think.
2. Don't spend time looking at the author's style or whether the author is convincing or has the experience to write a book such as this. Focus on the argument, the concepts, and the analysis.
3. What do I mean by analysis/analytical? If someone makes an argument or statement, it needs to be examined, not taken at face value. As a good reader and scholar, you want to see if you can answer the following questions. (You might not always be able to do this; authors aren't always clear, but if you can't answer them, then you've learned something about the author's argument right there -- it is unclear.)
    1. What is the major argument the author is making? What kind of cause--effect relationship does the author make? Can you summarize the argument for the whole book with one or two sentences? You should be able to do this.
    2. What are the theoretical assumptions the author makes? They may be explicit or implicit. They might be stated up front or you might have to search for them. Do these basic assumptions stack the deck? If those assumptions were changed, does it invalidate or significantly change the author's argument?
    3. What is the author's evidence? What is the quality of the author's evidence? Does the evidence support the argument?
    4. Are there hidden themes within the book, ideas that are not stated explicitly, but are crucial to the author's argument?
    5. If the arguments contain significant theoretical perspectives, do those perspectives fit other cases or the historical record as you know it?
    6. What are the implications of the author's argument? What does the argument say about the future?

Here's an example of a way to analyze an argument: Someone might say "China is an expansionist nation because it is going to invade Taiwan." Challenge that idea; analyze it. Ask and answer some questions. In this case the author's conclusion is that China is expansionist. The author's evidence is that China will eventually invade Taiwan. Is it valid to prove a point using as evidence something that has not yet happened? Can someone say "I know that you are hungry because I believe that you will eat soon?" Isn't that simply hypothetical? If China hasn't invaded Taiwan, but the author believes it will, then the entire argument is based not on what China is or has done, but on what the author perceives about China. Have we learned anything about China? No, but we have learned something about the author. (I'm using an example taken from an op-ed piece in the *Washington Post* from 1997, which used this exact logic.) Now, you may believe that China is an expansionist power, but the author

made a poor argument. So, you've got to make the argument stronger. If the author is convinced that China will invade Taiwan because China is building missile batteries along its eastern coast, buying equipment for amphibious landings, practicing amphibious landings, holding military exercises near Taiwan that simulate an invasion of an island, and saying "we will invade Taiwan" then the author has a better argument. What have we done here? We've done some basic social science analysis. We've challenged the author's argument, examined his cause and effect logic, and revealed his assumptions.

The introduction of your paper (Important!!!) This is the difference between an "A" and a "B"!

Writing for social science, in particular Political Science, is different from other types of writing. It is absolutely crucial that you make sure that the reader of your paper knows a few things all within the first couple of paragraphs of the paper. Here are the three key things the reader must know: (1) What is the author's main argument? (2) What is your view of that argument? (3) How are you going to go about supporting your argument? In other words, these first paragraphs or first paragraph should provide your reader with a "road map" that explains exactly what you will say during the paper. This is not as difficult as it sounds. Basically, what you need to do is write the outline you have for your paper in complete sentences in the first few paragraphs of the paper. This is different from journalism, or history, or magazine writing, but it is the way we do it in Political Science. The reader should know what you are going to say by the end of the introduction. It flows from the nature of government where your boss is a busy governmental official and has about two minutes of time to give to the five weeks of work you've been doing on some issue. For instance, let's say your boss is the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), and the DNI has asked you to write an analysis of whether Iran has nuclear weapons. The DNI needs a quick summary of your answer that can be digested in about five minutes because the DNI will be presenting that answer to the President of the US who will give the DNI about two minutes of his time. Importantly, the DNI will read your first paragraph and it better answer these questions: Does Iran have nuclear weapons or not? If so, for how long have they had them, and what will they do with those weapons? If not, why not, and will they develop them in the future?

The answers to those questions cannot be on page five of the paper. If they are, the DNI is unlikely to ask you to write any more papers, and you might actually be looking for new employment soon. The style needs to be very clear and concise and summarize everything in those first few paragraphs. In short, if Political Science scholars wrote mystery novels, the first sentence of the book would be: "The butler did it." This is why political scientists don't write mystery novels.

Here is an example of what I think is a good introduction to an analytical paper. This is a sample intro paragraph for an analysis of Fareed Zakaria's book *From Wealth to Power*. Notice how it summarizes Zakaria's ideas then adds the ideas of the paper's author.

> In *From Wealth to Power* Fareed Zakaria examines what causes wealthy nations to become "great powers" with large militaries and global foreign policy ambitions. Historically, some nations translate their wealth into power, while others do not. The reasons why nations make this transition is crucial – in almost all historical cases in which wealthy nations become militarily powerful the result is international conflict and/or war. Though most analysts say that the transition from wealth to power and ambition is inevitable, Zakaria argues that the key

ingredient in a nation's rise to global power lies within the domestic political system. When a nation's government becomes strong, ready to use the nation's resources for political ends at home, it also becomes ready to harness the nation's resources to achieve political goals abroad. His case study of the lag between US wealth (mid-19th century) and US ambition (late 19th century) provides an excellent argument of how the strength of the US government lagged behind the growth of its economy. Zakaria, however, has discounted two other important state-level factors that play a role in this transition: national ideology and historical legacy. First, some ideologies are more aggressive than others and will shape the way a nation deals with the rest of the world. Second, some nations have historical legacies that deeply influence their foreign policy: Russian insecurity, the US sense of international mission, or China's sense of regional dominance. Adding these variables into an assessment of a nation's potential rise to power brings a more accurate vision of what translates wealth to power. This paper will first examine Zakaria's argument then discuss the importance of national ideology and historical legacy. A conclusion considers the shape of the 21st century, speculating on the wealthy nations that will seek to increase their power in the international system. Ironically, this analysis suggests that even as the US declines in relative wealth, its ability to use national resources, its ideology, and its historical legacy will lead it to fight – politically and even militarily – to maintain its leadership role.

You could construct an outline of your paper, an outline that could be used to develop headings and subheadings in the paper:

1. Introduction
2. Zakaria: Domestic Ability to Use Resources for Foreign Policy Goals
3. The Missing Variables (these are your ideas)
    1. National ideology
    2. Historical Legacy
4. Conclusions: US Hegemony: Same Ambition, Less Wealth

The key here is that by the end of the first paragraph, I know what you will write about. I know what your analysis will be. I know your conclusions.

Citations

You don't need to do any research for the papers or use any sources except the assigned books. You should, however, cite information/ideas from the books. Do that using any style you like (parenthetical references, footnotes or endnotes). If you have questions about that, let me know.

Quotes

Avoid quoting the authors. These are short papers. Lots of quotes will take away from your writing and simply clutter up the paper. Often, students will take the key passages of a book or article and cut and paste it, rather than rewriting it in their own words (paraphrasing) then citing the source of the idea. This habit is a mistake for several reasons. First, no professor really wants to know if you can cut and paste, so it's not a skill you should practice. Second, when you write something in your own words, you really begin to understand it because you have to filter it through your thinking. Third, the

professor is grading you on your ideas, how well you understand the author's argument and how well you can analyze it. If you cut and paste the author's key points, the professor doesn't know if you understand it or only if you know how to cut and paste. In general, there really is no need to quote scholars or journalists in short papers. Quotes are important only if the exact words matter. In that case, quoting official documents or participants in an event is relevant. Otherwise, your words are better.

Nitpicks and Style Issues (Or Helpful Hints)

1. *Subject and Verb.* Make sure you have a subject and verb in every sentence. (You would be surprised how many important journals and books allow non-sentence sentences). This is non-fiction, not fiction. You need to observe the basic rules of grammar.
2. *Sentences.* This is not a sentence: "Which is why Russia is preparing to invade Ukraine." This is a clause. There is no subject to the sentence. You do see this a lot in magazines, but it is not the English language. It is bad editing.
3. *How to write about your point of view.* Style: No need to say "I agree" or "I disagree" or "I believe" in your paper. You're the author, so I'll assume whatever you're writing is your idea unless you specifically attribute the issue to the author ("Allison argues…"). A better way to write this is to be declarative: "Allison argues that the US and China are headed for World War III. He is mistaken for three reasons. First…." When you say "He is mistaken" the readers know that this is what you believe and that you disagree.
4. *Back up.* WHEN YOU TYPE YOUR PAPER ON A COMPUTER MAKE SURE YOU SAVE IT OFTEN, ESPECIALLY IF YOU USE A UNIVERSITY COMPUTER OR YOU SWITCH COMPUTERS. Here's the trick I use. Whenever I write, I back up and save to a thumb drive, but at the end of the day, I email myself the file of what I was working on. Use the email system of the university as your cloud account.
5. *The use of "I".* Try to avoid using "I" in non-fiction. Instead of "I will discuss three problems…" say "This essay addresses three problems…" Instead of saying "I agree" or "I disagree", try something like this: "Mearsheimer's argument is solid for three reasons…" (those three reasons are your argument/analysis). Or "Mearsheimer's argument has three major weaknesses…"
6. *Introducing the book.* I see this a lot, and you should try to avoid it. I was an English major when I entered college and if you do this in your paper, I will literally break out in hives. Students might begin their paper with a sentence like this: "In Audrey Kurth Cronin's book *Power to the People*, she explains the growing ability for non-state actors to use social media to influence nation-states." The problem is that the sentence refers to the author twice: by name and then as "she". That's awkward; it's two subjects for the sentence. How about this: "In *Power to the People*, Audrey Kurth Cronin explains the growing ability for non-state actors to use social media to influence nation-states." Much better. I don't have hives.
7. *The use of a semicolon.* Semicolons connect two complete sentences that are related to each other. For example: "I went to the pizzeria to get a pie; it was closed." You could also write them as two separate sentences if you wanted. The following would be an incorrect use of a semicolon: "I had six very tasty pizzas last week; except for that crappy one from the big chain store." That should be a comma, not a semicolon. The test is this: If the two sentences you are connecting with a semicolon could stand alone as complete sentences, then use a semicolon. It becomes obvious: "Except for that crappy one from the big chain store" is not a sentence.
8. *The use of "however".* This trips everyone up. It's a bit similar to semicolons. "I went to the pizzeria; however, when I got there, it was closed." Notice the semicolon, not the comma. That's

because "When I got there, it was closed" could be a complete sentence by itself. Also, this sentence is like the use of a semicolon. You are connecting two complete sentences. In this case, you're connecting two sentences that are related, but related in a very specific way. The second sentence is adding the "however" to show a different expectation than the first sentence implies. The first sentence implies you were going to eat pizza. The second sentence says you didn't. On the other hand, look at this example: "I went to the pizzeria. Upon arriving, however, I found out it was closed." The "however" is surrounded by commas. That's because "upon arriving" is not a sentence by itself. Here's another aspect of this. "I went to the pizzeria, the one with the best pizza in the world." There is a comma there because "the one with the best pizza in the world" is not a sentence by itself. These are the non-fiction rules. In fiction, you can do anything you want. Read James Joyce. I can't! There is no punctuation.

9. *Its and It's*. It's = It is. Its = possessive form. Talking about China, for example, would be "Its economy; its industry; its people." "It is raining" would be shortened to "It's raining."
10. *The word "nove*l". I've been seeing a lot of papers that refer to the book that is being reviewed as a "novel." None of these books are novels. A "novel", by definition, is a work of fiction. These are all non-fiction. In that sense, they are just "books."
11. *Numbers*. Numbers under 100 should be written as out. You would not have this sentence. "President Bush met with 3 advisers." It would be "President Bush met with three advisers."
12. *Acronyms*. When you have an acronym, such as NSDD-75 or UN. First write out the name in full: National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 75, or United Nations (UN). After that first use of the term, use the acronym.

Plagiarism and Avoiding It (Or "How to Use Other People's Ideas Legitimately")

First, never, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever cut and paste anything from a source into your document unless you place it in quotes and cite the source of the quote.

This is really not a fine line. Did you write the sentence or not? Did you come up with the idea or not? When in doubt, it's relatively simple: never include something in your paper that you did not write unless it is in quotes and then it also must be cited. Anything that is not your idea must be cited. Plagiarism is a violation of the VCU Honor Code and I will not hesitate to charge someone with a violation if I catch plagiarism. If you have questions about plagiarism, ask me or see VCU's Writing Integrity Workshop.

If paraphrasing an idea: make sure to change the verb you use so it is different from the verb used in the source. Make sure you change everything but the proper nouns. Let's say, you've read this in your source: "The president phoned the prime minister immediately after he received the news." That may be the point you want to make in your paper, but you shouldn't quote that and can't copy it (or you'd be plagiarizing). The only words you really can use here would be "president" and "prime minister." So, put it into your own words. How about: "Once the president had been informed, he contacted the prime minister." And then cite the source of the information. That would not be a quote problem or a suspicion of plagiarism.

But just because someone else has already written an idea that you agree with 100% doesn't mean you can't discuss it in your paper. Just point out whose idea it is; paraphrase it in your own words, cite the source of the idea, and expand upon it. Generally, that is how Political Science works. 90% of all Political Science articles and books do the following:

> There are various analyses of al-Qaeda's power. Realists say al-Qaeda is a nuisance, but has no real ability to achieve any of its regional and global goals (Stan 2004, pp 1-17). Regionalists disagree, arguing that al-Qaeda can use its passive support to instigate the overthrow of many governments in the Middle East; however, once it does so, it makes itself more vulnerable to destruction by conventional-style US military operations (Kyle 2005, pp 365-374). Other scholars contend that al-Qaeda could successfully achieve its goals. Once having taken control of several regimes in the Middle East, the US will not have the capability to fight four or five simultaneous wars such as the current war in Iraq; the US will only have one option – containment of a new revolutionary ideology in a new cold war, in which terrorism will play a key role in the balance of power (Cartman 2005, pp. 27-42). Each analysis has merit; however, this essay concludes that a significant effort by the US at bringing populations in the Middle East into the realm of global capitalism and democracy, if accompanied by a new emphasis on human rights and international labor standards, will isolate al-Qaeda from Muslim populations around the world and leave it an extremist and fringe organization.

The article would then outline the theories of the realists, regionalists, and others, analyze each one, and then develop the fourth theory. There is no problem as long as Stan, Kyle, and Cartman get credited with developing their theories, and the fourth theory is new. If the fourth theory belongs to a fourth author (Kenny? Timmy?), then these authors must be cited and your article will show why his theory is superior to the other three.

There are book reviews all over the web. Do not look at them. Of course, do not use them for your paper.

I will catch any plagiarism. It takes me less than ten seconds to take any sentence from your paper and cut and paste it into a google search engine. If you have taken the paper from a document on the web, google will identify the source in under a second. I know none of you would ever try this, so tell your friends. The VCU library has a tutorial on how to cite and avoid plagiarism: http://guides.library.vcu.edu/integrity.

And never, ever, ever, ever, ever, ever cut and paste anything from a source into your document unless you place it in quotes and cite the source of the quote. (He said it again! And in italics! Must mean something!) (And it's in bold, and italics, and red; maybe I should pay attention to this.)

Last points

1. Have you performed a spell check?
2. Have you performed a grammar check?

LATE PAPERS

I will mark late papers down ONE GRADE for each day late**.** That means that an almost perfect paper -- one that I would give 98 points to -- becomes an 88 if one day late, 78 if two days late... all the way down to 8 points if nine days late, and zero points if ten days late. Talk to me if you are having some family or personal problems. If there is a serious need to get an extension on the paper, I will give you an extension. *Also, remember that you have a rewrite. Hypothetically, if you are about to crash and burn on a paper and can't get me a finished product on time, hand me a rough draft (or a sentence). You'll get a horrible grade, but then use that paper as your rewrite. This is a built-in loophole. Use it if you need to. It's much better than a late penalty.*

Class Schedule

This is a tight schedule. Don't fall behind because you may not be able to catch up. All deadlines are soft deadlines, meaning that a paper due at midnight has wiggle room until the sun comes up.

May 23: Begin reading Mearsheimer

June 1: Mearsheimer paper due at midnight (as June 1 becomes June 2)

June 2: Begin reading Allison

June 11: Allison paper due at midnight (as June 11 becomes June 12)

June 12: Begin reading Jervis

June 21: Jervis paper due at midnight (as June 21 becomes June 22)

June 22: Begin reading Collier

July 1: Collier paper due at midnight (as July 1 becomes July 2)

July 2: Begin reading Sikkink

July 13:

- Sikkink paper due (as July 13 becomes July 14)
- Rewrite also due at midnight (although you can turn this in at any earlier time if you choose)