Course objectives

This course will cover all major elements of North American security and defence policy, including the history of war and the theory of strategy, the Canadian and American national cultures and their “ways of war,” the political determinants of Canadian and American approaches to security and defence in a comparative context, the “special relationship” between Canada and the United States, contemporary issues in Canadian and American responses to global terrorism and future threats, practical questions about binational planning for the security of the North American Continent, and legal and ethical problems arising from the conflict between security and civil liberties. Students will be invited to explore specific issues of interest, and class discussion of specific issues, especially in the later part of the class, will be determined in part by issues students select in their papers. Grading will be based primarily on formal written work (there will be no final exam, although there will be a short in-class quiz) and students will be required to produce written product which is professional in form and analytical in substance. Students who cannot be bothered to pay attention to the specific requirements for written work (which will be made available) should not take this course. Those who do should find that this course is substantively informative, intellectually stimulating, and relevant to future work as graduate students in social sciences or policy analysts in government agencies or military services.

Course requirements

Table of requirements at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Written products (oral discussion is also required)</th>
<th>Due dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Analytical paper (35%)</td>
<td>17 July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Policy paper (35%)</td>
<td>7 August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Threat assessment memo (15%)</td>
<td>24 July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Operational planning memo (15%)</td>
<td>31 July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pass/fail quiz (half-point penalty on final grade for failure)</td>
<td>9 August 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 PSCI 3607 is defined in the Undergraduate Calendar as “The evolution of Canadian and U.S. security and defence policy as it pertains to North America. Contemporary issues and development.” Prerequisites are third-year standing and one of PSCI 2001 (Introduction à la politique canadienne), PSCI 2002 (Canadian Political Environment), PSCI 2003 (Canadian Political Institutions), PSCI 2601 (International Relations: Global Politics), or PSCI 2602 (International Relations: Global Political Economy).
Grading will be based primarily on written work, described below. There will be no final exam, but there will be an easy pass/fail quiz on the last day of class, which every student should pass without difficulty. (This is mainly for the benefit of students who do not understand that paying attention to the lectures and the assigned readings is actually relevant to their success on their written work.) Students are also required to be available in class to discuss their written work product (which may be specifically scheduled in advance upon request, at the discretion of the instructor) and will automatically lose one grade point on the relevant product if not present when called upon. (This requirement for class discussion of written work is usually a “pass/fail” requirement, in which any good faith attempt to discuss the issue is sufficient to meet the requirement, in order to reduce the anxiety which some students have about oral presentations. It is not intended to be a formal presentation, but merely a discussion. The student is expected, however, to be familiar with important points in the sources used for a paper. In a few cases, a student might convince the instructor to raise the grade previously assigned to the written work by means of an oral discussion which better illuminates the analysis.) In grading papers and memos, a major criterion will be whether or not the analysis incorporates relevant concepts and facts from the lectures. Total written work should be less than 12 pages, but papers and memos require serious reading of good sources and serious analytical thought. Copious references are not required. But reliable references are. Written work must conform to basic formal requirements (which will be made available via email or computer disk). Written work is required, absent valid individual excuse and permission of the instructor, to be presented in class on the due date. Any work not so submitted will automatically be deemed late (even if turned into the office on the same day) and will be reduced one grade point each day late, beginning with the due day. Please consult with the instructor as soon as possible about any special needs. Note other specific requirements in the following list of assignments.

1. **Two short papers.** Two papers, each 3-5 pages, each worth 35%, together 70% of total grade. The student is also required to be available to discuss the paper in class when called upon. These must be in good standard academic form. These are an analytical paper and a policy paper.

   a. **Analytical paper.** The first paper is a theoretical and empirical analysis of a historical or contemporary case in Canadian or American security or defence policy. This means that it is an analysis of cause and effect, which explains why a particular policy was adopted, or why it succeeded or failed. It may emphasize either a theoretical or empirical approach, but it must show some application of theory to fact. That is, it may not be merely a theoretical argument. It must focus on some concrete case. But it must also be more than merely a historical review of the case. It must propose some theory of explanation. **Hints:** Comparative analyses of cases, whether comparisons of relevant contemporary cases, or comparisons of relevant cases in different historical periods, are almost always helpful to student papers. A clear research question is better than a simplistic thesis, and it is better to be intellectually honest about the complexity of the problem than to propose that one can definitely solve it.

   b. **Policy paper.** The second paper, which must concern a case or issue distinct from the first paper, is a policy paper, which proposes a concrete policy argument, including a realistic concept of how the policy would be implemented, and which takes into account economic and political feasibility, for the improvement of Canadian, American, or binational security or defence. Although the primary focus of this paper is policy, it should be dispassionate argument, which avoids rhetoric or emotion, and which does not belabor the goodness of obvious goals. The point is not to explain why the goal is good, but how the policymakers can realistically accomplish the given goal. **Hints:** Keep in mind that a good policy paper is actually a policy analysis, in that any credible argument for a particular policy is also an argument for a cause and effect, an argument that the proposed policy will actually accomplish the goal.

---

2 Grades will be assigned and calculated according to the Carleton 12-point system: 0 (F), 1 (D-), 2 (D), 3 (D+), 4 (C-), 5 (C), 6 (C+), 7 (B-), 8 (B), 9 (B+), 10 (A-), 11 (A), 12 (A+). A “grade point” means one point in this 12-point system.
And remember, above all, that this is a class in political science, and that you should therefore take into account the political feasibility of your proposal. Avoid grandiose or heroic concepts. Avoid vague generalities. Focus on a proposal which is specific, concrete, and incremental. Honestly take into account the downsides of your own proposal.

Both papers must be submitted in good academic form, with proper citations, in accordance with the writing guidance which will be made available. Two credible sources, books or journal articles, from credible scholars, analysts, or organizations are sufficient as references. Properly identified web sources may be used for official reports from government agencies or NGOs, or for basic data and statistics, but should be not be relied upon as a substitutes for books or journals. Papers will be graded on propriety of format and citations, clarity of research question or thesis, whether the research question or thesis is of substantive interest (as opposed to being hopelessly vague or painfully obvious), the clarity of focus throughout the paper, and the basic logic of analysis. Vague, general, convoluted, and pompous writing will not be rewarded. Writing which is clear, concrete, specific, and logical will be.

In some cases, the instructor may question the student in order to insure that the student has really engaged the case or the sources used, and a student who appears to be unfamiliar with important points in the sources used may lose points on grade previously given to the paper.

2. Two staff memos. Two staff memos, each one page only, each worth 15%, together 30% of total grade. According to a prescribed format (which will be made available), these will be one-page single-spaced memos which concisely summarize a “staff study” in response to a developing crisis scenario (which will be made available and discussed in class), written from the perspective of a staff officer in the Canadian or US government, in an agency chosen by the student, with responsibility for security or defence. (See the list below, following the references.) The student is also required to be available to discuss the memo in class when called upon. Students are invited to work together in groups and produce a group staff memo, to be graded as a group effort, but this is not required. Normal academic citations are not required, there is no requirement for a minimum number of academic sources, and the memos may be based on a wide variety of sources, beyond those normally used for an academic paper, including web sites and personal communications with actors in government agencies or NGOs. But students should still take care in evaluating the reliability of sources. These are a threat assessment memo and an operational planning memo.

a. Threat assessment memo. The threat assessment memo evaluates the threats presented by the crisis scenario relevant to the jurisdiction, tasking, and resources of the selected agency, and states, as realistically as possible, within given economic, political, and legal limitations, the priority actions which the agency should take in response to the threats. This is the “stand up” phase of the crisis, in which the agency is mobilizing for threats not fully manifest, and is also scrambling to assure its political masters that it has the situation under control, while perhaps also simultaneously seeking to remind them of its need for more resources or authority to perform the mission.

b. Operational planning memo. In response to further development of the crisis scenario, the operational planning memo proposes actual response actions. It other words, it propose a concept of operations, to guide actual deployment of resources or invocation of authorizes, for senior officers and political master to sign off on. It might also take into account whether or not the prior threat assessment memos, from the same student, or other students, were appropriate planning guides to the developing crisis. A student may continue to play the same role, or change roles or agency.

The memos should be closely focused on the actual responsibly and resources of the given agency, although they should also take into account the need for interagency and binational or international
coordination in response to the crisis. This requires the student to conduct some sort of research on the selected agency. And the memos should be as realistic as possible. But they may also propose realistic changes to the responsibilities or resources of the agency which are required in order to better deal with the crisis. The one-page limitation is absolute. The student must struggle, as do real-world staff officers, to clearly summarize complicated problems in short briefing notes or “bullets,” as they are presented in an executive summary to senior officers and political leaders. But this does not mean that vague generalizations or simplistic truisms are welcome. (Just because politicians and senior officers put out pap in their public statements does not mean that they want to see it from their staff officers.) The bullets should be specific and concrete, they should focus on necessary actions, and they should evidence serious underlying thought about the complexity of the problem. In other words, if you think that it is easy to write such a memo, because it is so short, you will be sadly disappointed in your grade. These require serious study and thought. And they require unaccustomed conciseness in expression. The memos will be discussed and debated in class.

3. **Quiz**

Finally, on the last day of class, there will be a short pass/fail in-class quiz, merely to assure minimal attention to the lectures and class discussion throughout the class. Every student should easily pass, without special studying. And the instructor will also make lecture notes available to the students via email, which will cover most of the questions on the quiz. But failure to take the quiz, or an abysmal performance on the quiz, will be penalized by reduction of the final grade by one half point, before the final rounding of the grade average to the whole point.³ At the discretion of the instructor, a notably superior score on the quiz may be grounds for rounding up of a final grade point average which is near but not quite at the normal half-point for rounding up.

**Schedule**

**Tuesday 3 July 2007 ~ Introduction, the study of politics, theories of world politics**

Explanation of course, discussion of student interests. The basics of political theory in world politics and strategic studies, and the use of rationality and culture as approaches to explanation. Discussion of real-world applications of academic theory. Why are we here, why does anyone care, and what does it have to do with your real life after you graduate? What is the “science” in political science? What are the ways in which political science can explain or enhance the decisions of the US and Canada in security and defence matters? Is there a meaningful connection between the world of academia and the world of government, the military, and law enforcement? See references §§ 1-2.

**Thursday 5 July 2007 ~ World politics and war, US and Canadian political culture**

Political theory and international relations theory, the history and theory of war and military strategy, the political culture of the US and Canada as “nations made by war.” Why are Americans and Canadians the way they are? What are their basic similarities and differences in political culture, and why? See references §§ 2-5.

**Tuesday 10 July 2007 ~ World politics and war, US and Canada, continued**

The US and Canadian “ways of war,” the development of the US “national security state” and the “American Empire,” Canadian culture and the “special relationships” with the British and American empires. How do Americans and Canadians seek to protect their national security in the modern age, and are they actually rational in doing so? Begin reading assigned texts, and see references §§ 6-7. Discussion of topics for the analytical paper.

³ For example, if the average is 8.75, which would be rounded up to 9 for a B+ in the final grade, failure on the quiz would result in deduction of 0.50 to 8.25, which would be rounded down to 8 for a B on the final grade.
Thursday 12 July 2007 ~ Theories of war and peace, methods of analysis, writing papers


Tuesday 17 July 2007 ~ “Clash of Civilizations,” the “War on Terror,” and “American Empire”

Analytical papers due. The “clash of civilizations” and the nature of the “War on Terror.” Why COC and WOT? Is it a clash of “civilizations,” or something else? It is something very new, or something very old? Is the WOT something new, or perhaps much like something we have been through before? Can we win a WOT? More discussion and debate of the problem of “American empire” and the Canadian response to it. Assigned texts, again: Layne and Thayer, *American Empire*; Cooper and Rowlands, *Canada Among Nations 2005*, chapters 1-7. See references §§ 4-5, 8-10, 13.

Thursday 19 July 2007 ~ Analytical papers, security threats, organizations, and crisis scenario

Initial discussion of analytical papers. Presentation and discussion of crisis scenario, act I. See references § 12. How do Americans and Canadians organize to fight them, over there, or over here? Do the US and Canada have the right strategies for the threat or the right forces for the mission? See references §§ 4-7, especially Sloan, *Security and Defence in the Terrorist Era*, and documents on official US and Canadian security policy. For a sanity check, see also references § 13.

Tuesday 24 July 2007 ~ Analytical papers continued

Threat assessment memos due. Discussion and debate of analytical papers continued.

Thursday 26 July 2007 ~ Threat assessments, and future threats to North American security

Discussion and debate of threat assessment memos. Presentation and discussion of crisis scenario, act II. See references §§ 5, 12. Future horrors, some worse than terrorism. Are we ready for what’s next? (Is it obvious that this is a rhetorical question?) See references §§ 5, 9.

Tuesday 31 July 2007 ~ Future of relations among US, Canada, and the world

Operational planning memos due. The future of the Western Alliance and the world. Where do we go from here, Americans and Canadians both, in the next phase of the American Empire, or perhaps after the American Empire? What will be the future shape of geopolitics? Who will be the allies and opponents in the next world war? Assigned text: Cooper and Rowlands, *Canada Among Nations 2005*, chapters 8-12. See references § 2, 9-10.

Thursday 2 August 2007 ~ Conclusion of the crisis, security and liberty

Discussion and debate of operational planning memos. Lecture and debates on the conflict between security and liberty in the US and Canada. Is there necessarily a conflict between security and liberty, or between interests and values? Have either the US or Canada found the right balance? Can liberal democracies flourish in an environment of unending war? Do either US or Canadian domestic security policies actually serve a rational long-term strategy in the WOT? See references §§ 11-13. Discussion of upcoming policy papers. See references § 1 and writing guidance.
Tuesday 7 August 2007 ~ Policy papers

Policy papers due. Initial discussion and debate of policy papers. Instructor’s opportunity to backfill material in prior lectures, and student’s opportunity to ask about upcoming quiz.

Thursday 9 August 2007 ~ Policy papers continued, quiz, conclusions and comments

Discussion and debate of policy papers continued. Review of basic theory, discussion of conclusions from class. Pass/fail quiz. Discussion of answers to quiz. Student comments on class.

Assigned texts


Supplied readings (among others), documents on official US and Canadian security policy


Recommended additional text


References

§ 1. Fundamentals of political analysis (see also writing guidance)

Almond, Gabriel A., A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science (1990) {JA71.A475}.
Whyte, Jamie, Crimes Against Logic: Exposing the Bogus Arguments of Politicians, Priests, Journalists, and Other Serial Offenders (2005) {BC175.W45}.

§ 2. Theories of politics and international relations (see also § 3)

Burchill, Scott, ed., Theories of International Relations (2005) {JZ1242.T48}.


§ 3. History and theory of war (see also § 2)


§ 4. US foreign, defence, and security policy (see also § 6)

Theoretical perspectives and ideology in US foreign policy, models of decision-making

Campbell, Colton C., Nicol C. Rae, and John F. Stack, Jr., eds., *Congress and the Politics of Foreign Policy* (2003) {KF4651.C657}.
Spanier, John, and Joseph Nogee, eds., *Congress, the Presidency, and American Foreign Policy* (1981) {KF4651.A5 C58}.

US foreign policy up to 1900, and the general tradition of national expansion, US exceptionalism, cycles of isolationism and imperialism


US foreign policy 1900-1990: The World Wars and the Cold War


Roskin, Michael, “From Pearl Harbor to Vietnam: Shifting Generational Paradigms and Foreign Policy,” *Political Science Quarterly* 89.3 (Autumn 1974) 563-588 {H1.P8}.


Scheuer, Michael, *Imperial Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror* (2004) {HV6432.I47}.


§ 5. Canadian foreign, defence, and security policy (see also §§ 7, 12)

The *Canada Among Nations* Series

*Canada Among Nations*, a series of separately edited and published books by a changing collection of Canadian scholars, beginning in 1984, constitutes a sort of annual journal on Canadian foreign policy and defence, and it contains what may be the most useful set of articles focused on Canadian security and defence issues. The collection may usually be found near LOC call number FC242. The most recent editions, after 2001, in chronological order, are:


Other works on Canadian foreign, defence, and security policy


§ 6. The American way of war


§ 7. The Canadian way of war

§ 8. The “clash of civilizations”

Scheuer, Michael (Anonymous), *Imperial Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror* (2004) {HV6432.I47}.


§ 10. Comparisons and relations between the US and the Western Allies


Heo, Uk, and Shale A. Horowitz., eds., *Conflict in Asia: Korea, China-Taiwan, and India-Pakistan* (2003) {DS910.2.K7C66}.


§ 11. Security and liberty


Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), *Submission to the House of Commons Subcommittee on Public Safety and National Security regarding the review of the Anti-Terrorism Act* (28 February 2005), www.caut.ca [supplied reading].


§ 12. Scenarios


§ 13. Humor (with an element of deadly seriousness)


### Relevant Binational, Canadian, and US Agencies

| Permanent Joint Board on Defence | US National Security Council |
| Bi-national Planning Group | Department of Defense |
| North American Aerospace Defense Command | Department of the Army |
| Security and Prosperity Partnership Working Groups | US Marine Corps |
| Integrated Border Enforcement Teams | Department of the Navy |
| CA Cabinet Com Security, Pub Health, Emergencies | US Marine Corps |
| CA Interdepartmental Com Security, Intelligence | Department of the Air Force |
| Canada Department of National Defence | Defense Intelligence Agency |
| Defence Intelligence | Assistant Secretary Defense Homeland Defense |
| Communications Security Establishment | Assistant Secretary Defense Reserve Affairs |
| Canadian Army | National Guard |
| Canadian Army Reserve | Northern Command |
| Canadian Navy | US Department of Homeland Security |
| Canadian Air Force | Transportation Security Administration |
| Canada Command | Customs and Border Protection |
| Canadian Special Operations Forces Command | Border Patrol |
| Joint Task Force 2 | Secret Service |
| Public Safety Canada | Citizenship and Immigration Services |
| Emergency Mgt, National Security Branch | Immigration and Customs Enforcement |
| Policing, Law Enforce, Interoperability Branch | Federal Emergency Management Agency |
| Transport Canada | US Coast Guard |
| Safety and Security Groups | US Department of Justice |
| Canadian Air Transport Security Authority | Federal Bureau of Investigation |
| Citizenship and Immigration Canada | Bureau Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, Explosives |
| Canada Border Services Agency | US National Central Bureau |
| Royal Canadian Mounted Police | Office of Intelligence Policy and Review |
| National Security Investigations Branch | Office State Local Domestic Preparedness |
| Integrated National Security Enforcement Teams | US Office of the Director of National Intelligence |
| Canadian Security and Intelligence Service | National Counterterrorism Center |
| Integrated Threat Assessment Centre | US Central Intelligence Agency |
| | US National Security Agency |

### Academic Accommodations

**For Students with Disabilities:** Students with disabilities requiring academic accommodations in this course are encouraged to contact the Paul Menton Centre (PMC) for Students with Disabilities (500 University Centre) to complete the necessary forms. After registering with the PMC, make an appointment to meet with the instructor in order to discuss your needs **at least two weeks before the first in-class test or CUTV midterm exam.** This will allow for sufficient time to process your request. Please note the following deadlines for submitting completed forms to the PMC for formally scheduled exam accommodations: **June 8, 2007** for June examinations, and **July 27, 2007** for August examinations.
For Religious Observance: Students requesting accommodation for religious observances should apply in writing to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such requests should be made during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist, but no later than two weeks before the compulsory academic event. Accommodation is to be worked out directly and on an individual basis between the student and the instructor(s) involved. Instructors will make accommodations in a way that avoids academic disadvantage to the student. Instructors and students may contact an Equity Services Advisor for assistance (www.carleton.ca/equity).

For Pregnancy: Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a letter of accommodation. Then, make an appointment to discuss your needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.

Plagiarism: The Undergraduate Calendar defines plagiarism as: “to use and pass off as one's own idea or product, work of another without expressly giving credit to another.” The Graduate Calendar states that plagiarism has occurred when a student either: (a) directly copies another's work without acknowledgment; or (b) closely paraphrases the equivalent of a short paragraph or more without acknowledgment; or (c) borrows, without acknowledgment, any ideas in a clear and recognizable form in such a way as to present them as the student's own thought, where such ideas, if they were the student's own would contribute to the merit of his or her own work. Instructors who suspect plagiarism are required to submit the paper and supporting documentation to the Departmental Chair who will refer the case to the Dean. It is not permitted to hand in the same assignment to two or more courses. The Department's Style Guide is available at: www.carleton.ca/polisci/undergrad/styleguide.pdf

Oral Examination: At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required to pass a brief oral examination on research papers and essays.

Submission and Return of Term Work: Papers must be handed directly to the instructor and will not be date-stamped in the departmental office. Late assignments may be submitted to the drop box in the corridor outside B640 Loeb. Assignments will be retrieved every business day at 4 p.m., stamped with that day's date, and then distributed to the instructor. For essays not returned in class please attach a stamped, self-addressed envelope if you wish to have your assignment returned by mail. Please note that assignments sent via fax or email will not be accepted. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

Approval of final grades: Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by an instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.

Course Requirements: Students must fulfill all course requirements in order to achieve a passing grade. Failure to hand in any assignment will result in a grade of F. Failure to write the final exam will result in a grade of ABS. FND (Failure – No Deferred) is assigned when a student's performance is so poor during the term that they cannot pass the course even with 100% on the final examination. In such cases, instructors may use this notation on the Final Grade Report to indicate that a student has already failed the course due to inadequate term work and should not be permitted access to a deferral of the examination. Deferred final exams are available ONLY if the student is in good standing in the course.

Connect Email Accounts: The Department of Political Science strongly encourages students to sign up for a campus email account. Important course and University information will be distributed via the Connect email system. See http://connect.carleton.ca for instructions on how to set up your account.