

Dr. Garret J. Martin

Thursday

School of International Service

8.10-10.40pm

(historic) 307 EQB 200

Email:

Office Hours: by appointment

Transatlantic Security

The purpose of the course is to help students develop a better understanding of transatlantic security institutions, actors, and processes (e.g. NATO, EU-related, and bilateral arrangements). In addition, course analysis and debate will focus on prominent issues of contention and areas of cooperation, as well as strategic cultures (informed by history, government structures, and political cultures) on both sides of the Atlantic.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- 1) Understanding of transatlantic security trends, issues, as well as scholarly and policy debates about them.
- 2) Knowledge of key actors, institutions, and processes involved in transatlantic security decision-making and implementation.
- 3) Analysis of transatlantic security policy issues using knowledge of history, practical challenges, political institutions, processes and cultures.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students will be able to:

- Describe, analyze and evaluate the evolving transatlantic security relationship.
- Conduct research on and critically examine historic and contemporary transatlantic security issues applying knowledge of history, institutions, political processes and practical restraints; synthesize relevant literature; present the varying perspectives and issue policy recommendations.

- Identify, define, and explain prominent transatlantic security concepts, themes, institutions, theories, and issues.

BOOKS AVAILABLE AT THE CAMPUS BOOKSTORE:

Robert Kagan, *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order* (New York: Knopf, 2003).

Wyn Rees, *Transatlantic Counter-Terrorism Cooperation: The New Imperative* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

See also: Transatlantic Trends Survey: <http://www.gmfus.org/trends/>

Case Studies: Cases are available via the John F. Kennedy School of Government case program website at <http://www.ksgcase.harvard.edu/> and the Georgetown University Institute of the Study of Diplomacy website at <http://www.guisd.org/>

Note: All other readings listed on the syllabus will be available on Blackboard or emailed by the professor.

GRADING POLICY AND STANDARDS:

Attendance is mandatory. If you miss a class due to an illness you are expected to inform the professor before class. **You must also complete a one-page paper summarizing the main issues addressed by the weekly readings.**

Civil Discussion: This course cannot function without heavy student engagement in class discussion. Students will be expected to have read the material for the week, as listed on the syllabus, prior to class. Give and take between students is critical for the class, but so is civil discussion. Be aware of others, and please consider (and try to avoid) the 90/10 rule—that is, there is a gradual tendency of 90% of the talking to be done by 10% of the class.

Graduate Students:

Participation: 20%

Discussion Leadership: 20%

“Taking Sides” Assignments & Discussion (choose 2 below): 15%

Briefing: 20%

Research Paper (20 pages): 25% (due December 15, 2011 by the beginning of class)

Undergraduate Students:

Participation: 20%

Discussion Leadership: 15%

“Taking Sides” Assignments & Discussion (choose 2 below): 20%

Longer Paper (12-15 pages): 25% (due November 10, 2011, at the beginning of class)

Final Exam: 20% (December 15, 2010, 8.10-10.10pm)

Class Participation: This course relies heavily on student engagement in class discussion. The give and take between students will be crucial to the exchange of ideas. Since the course is designed in discussion format with students leading each week’s discussion, students will have plenty of opportunity to express their views and ideas during the term. Please note that students are expected to read all assigned readings for a particular class before that class begins. Participation should be qualitative as well as quantitative. Critical thoughts and original analysis will be important for this part of the grade. Be aware of others, and please consider (and try to avoid) the 90/10 rule

Discussion leader presentation: Discussion leaders will be chosen to lead each class based on the course readings. In order to facilitate discussion, the leaders will need to prepare questions based on the readings for the class. These questions should be cleared by the instructor and distributed via Blackboard NO LATER THAN 6PM the night before class. The questions will help you plan the class session and the issues you want to cover, but always leave room for open discussion. The discussion is not a presentation; discussion leaders may not monopolize discussion or substitute presentation for leading discussion; students who are not leading discussion are expected to come prepared to discuss the week’s reading.

Discussion leaders will be expected to communicate in person, by e-mail, or phone among themselves to coordinate their presentations and distribution of the questions. Feel free to communicate with me for any reason about any aspect of your presentation. You are also welcome to use handouts, multimedia, or any other approaches or tools you deem necessary to make the presentation more effective

DISABILITIES:

If you experience difficulty in this course for any reason, please don't hesitate to consult with me. In addition to the resources of the department, a wide range of services is available to support you in your efforts to meet the course requirements. If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please notify me in a timely manner with a letter from the Academic Support Center or Disability Support Services so that we can address your needs.

Academic Support Center (x3360, MGC 243) offers study skills workshops, individual instruction, tutor referrals, and services for students with learning disabilities. Writing support is available in the ASC Writing Lab or in the Writing Center, Battelle 228.

Counseling Center (x3500, MGC 214) offers counseling and consultations regarding personal concerns, self-help information, and connections to off-campus mental health resources.

Disability Support Services (x3315, MGC 206) offers technical and practical assistance with accommodations for students with physical, medical, or psychological disabilities.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS:

In the event of a declared pandemic (influenza or other communicable disease), AU will implement a plan for meeting the needs of all members of the university community. Should the university be required to close for a period of time, we are committed to ensuring that all aspects of our educational programs will be delivered to our students. These may include altering and extending the duration of the traditional term schedule to complete essential instruction in the traditional format and/or use of distance instructional methods. Specific strategies will vary from class to class, depending on the format of the course and the timing of the emergency. Faculty will communicate class-specific information to students via AU e-mail and Blackboard, while students must inform their faculty immediately of any absence due to illness. Students are responsible for checking their AU e-mail regularly and keeping themselves informed of emergencies. In the event of a declared pandemic or other emergency, students should refer to the AU Web site (www.prepared.american.edu) and the AU information line at (202) 885-1100 for general university-wide information, as well as contact their faculty and/or respective dean's office for course and school/ college-specific information.

Transatlantic Security: History, Institutions, and Strategic Cultures**WEEK 1: Introduction and Overview**

Thursday, September 1

- Paul Hockenos, “Rethinking US-Europe Relations,” IP Global Edition (spring 2009).
- Robert Lieber, “An American View of Transatlantic Relations,” in *Perceptions and Policy in Transatlantic Relations*, ed. Natividad Fernandez Sola and Michael Smith (New York: Routledge, 2009).
- Sophie Meunier, “Do Transatlantic Relations Still Matter?” *Council for European Studies Perspectives on Europe* 40.1 (spring 2010).
- Jackson Janes, “Sharing Global Responsibilities,” IP Global Edition (May/June 2010).

AT ISSUE (*these notes are designed to help students prepare for some of the major themes, concepts, and questions that will be addressed in each class session*): (How much) do transatlantic relations still matter?; stereotypes; similarities and differences between the US and Europe.

WEEK 2: Transatlantic Security after WWII: 1945-1991

Thursday, September 8

- Richard Kugler, “NATO Chronicle: The Cold War Years,” *Joint Force Quarterly* (spring 99).
- James Miller, “A Short History of NATO,” *Department of State Bulletin* (August 1989).
- David Schwartz, *NATO’s Nuclear Dilemmas* (Washington DC: Brookings, 1983), pp.1-10.
- “Managing NATO ~~Deliberate Business: The~~ of Government Case Program, 1984, parts A and B. ~~December 1979~~”
- Federiga Bindi, “European Union Foreign Policy: A Historical Overview,” in *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*, ed. Federiga Bindi (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2010), pp. 13-25.
- Michael Harrison and Mark McDonough, “Negotiations on the French Withdrawal from NATO,” *Georgetown Case Study* 301 (1988).
- Mary Elise Sarotte, “Perpetuating NATO’s Preeminence: The 1990 Deals to “Bribe the Soviets Out” and Move NATO In,” *International Security* 35.1 (summer 2010).
- George H. Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Knopf, 1998), chapter 8 (“A German Question”).

AT ISSUE: Evolution of NATO and European Integration; review of NATO strategies and relevant debates; extended deterrence.

WEEK 3: Transatlantic Security after the End of the Cold War: 1991-2001

Thursday, September 15

- NATO Handbook (Brussels: NATO Press, 2001): Chapters 2, 4, and 7.
- Fraser Ceron, "The Role of the EU and WEU in European Security," in European Security, ed. Wilfried von Bredow, Thomas Jaeger and Gerhard Kuemmel (London: Macmillan, 1997).
- Javier Solana, "NATO's Success in Kosovo," Foreign Affairs (November/December 1999).
- Dagmar Skrpec, "European and American Reactions to Kosovo: The Policy Divide Revisited in the Iraq War," SAIS Review 23.2 (summer/fall 2003).
- Ivo Daalder and Michael O Hanlon, "The U Washington Quarterly 23.4 (2000).
- Alexander Safronov, "New Trials for Europe and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership: A View from Russia," Mediterranean Quarterly 11.2 (spring 2000).
- Harvey Waterman et al., "Correspondence: NATO and Democracy," International Security 26.3 (winter 2001/2002).
- Wallace Thies, Dorle Hellmuth and Raymond Millen, "Does NATO Enlargement Spread Democracy? Evidence from Three Cases," Democracy and Security (July-December 2006).
- Mike McGwire, "NATO Expansion: „A Policy Error of Historic Importance, "" Review of International Studies 24 (1998).
- Robert Keohane and Lisa Martin, "The Promise of Internationalist Theory," International Security 20.1 (summer 1995).
- John Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," International Security 19.3 (winter 1994/95).
- Jonathan Sireci and Damon Coletta, "Enduring without an Enemy: NATO ""s Realist Foundation," Perspectives 17.1 (2009).

TAKING SIDES 1: Can NATO remain an effective military and political alliance if it keeps growing?

AT ISSUE: Applying IR theories to analyze NATO enlargement and endurance; evolving CSFP/WEU; NATO's "out of area" operations in the Balkans.

WEEK 4: Transatlantic Security after 9/11: Afghanistan and Iraq

Thursday, September 22

- Wyn Rees, Transatlantic Counter Terrorism Cooperation, Chapter 5.

- James Sperling and Mark Webber, “NATO: From Kosovo to Kabul,” *International Affairs* 85.3 (2009).
- Leo Michel, “NATO Decision-making: Au Revoir to the Consensus Rule?” *Strategic Forum* 202 (Washington DC: NDU, 2003).
- Renee De Nevers, “NATO’s International Security Role in the Terrorist Era,” *International Security* 31.4 (spring 2007).
- Ellen Williams, “Out of Area and Very Much in Business? NATO, the U.S., and the Post-9/11 International Security Environment,” *Comparative Strategy* 27 (2008).
- Heinz Theisen, “Exit Strategy for a Culture War,” *IP Global Edition* (1/2010).
- Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress, *Mobilizing NATO for Afghanistan and Pakistan: An Assessment of Alliance Capabilities* (Washington DC: Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress, 2010), pp. 1-23.
- “NATO „Burden-Sharing in Afghanistan” A Speech by Liam Fox, MP, The Heritage Foundation, 21 September 2009.
- Andrew Moravcsik, “Striking a New Transatlantic Bargain,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2003).
- Ronja Kempin and Stefan Steinicke, “EUPOL Afghanistan: The Credibility Test for Europe’s Civilian Engagement,” in *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence?* ed. Muriel Asseburg and Ronja Kempin (Berlin: SWP, 2009).
- “Joanna Buckley, “Can the EU be More Effective in Afghanistan?” *Centre for European Reform Policy Brief* (April 2010).
- Guido Steinberg, “The European Union Integrated Rule of Law Mission for Iraq (EUJUST LEX): A Policy Surrogate with Potential,” in *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence?* ed. Asseburg and Kempin (Berlin: SWP, 2009).

TAKING SIDES 2: Can and should Europe bridge the capabilities gap?

AT ISSUE: burden sharing debate; what roles for NATO and the EU in Iraq and Afghanistan?

WEEK 5: Transatlantic Security after 9/11: Of Paradise and Power

Thursday, September 29

- Robert Kagan, *America and Europe in the New World Order* (New York: Knopf, 2003).
- Philip Gordon, “Bridging the Atlantic Divide,” *Foreign Affairs* 82.1 (Jan/Feb 2003).
- Book review by Frank Costigliola, *Political Science Quarterly* 118.3 (Fall 2003).
- David Calleo, “Of Power, Wealth, and Wisdom,” *National Interest* 72 (Summer 2003).

AT ISSUE: Is Kagan right?

WEEK 6: TAS after 9/11: EU Common Foreign and Security Policy after Lisbon

Thursday, October 6

- “Chapter 13: Europe,” in *Global Strategic Assessment 2009: America’s Security Role in a Changing World* (Washington, DC: NDU Press, 2010), pp. 285-297.
- Stephan Keukeleire, “European Security and Defense Policy: From Taboo to a Spearhead of EU Foreign Policy,” in *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*, ed. Federiga Bindi (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2010), pp. 51-72.
- Neil Winn, “CFSP, ESDP, and the Future of European Security: Whither NATO?” *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 9.2 (winter/spring 2003).
- Sven Biscop, “NATO and the ESDP: Complementing or Competing?” in *EU Enlargement & the Transatlantic Alliance*, ed. Sven Biscop and Johan Lembke (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2008).
- Clara O’Donnell, “Can Europe Reform,” *Foreign Affairs*, July 27, 2009.
- Jessica Riester, “Transatlantic Relations After the Lisbon Treaty: Ready for Action, or More Process?” *AICGS Issue Brief* 37 (June 2010).
- Thierry Chopin and Maxime Lefebvre, “Three Phone Numbers for Europe: Will the Lisbon Treaty Make the European Union More Effective Abroad?” *Brookings US-Europe Analysis Series* Number 43 (January 6, 2010).
- Daniel Korski, “Player or Pawn,” *IP Global Edition* (May/June 2010).
- Ulrike Guerot, “After Lisbon: Is Europe Becoming a Global Power?” *IP Global Edition* (January/February 2010).
- Toby Vogel, “Stumbling to a Start,” *IP Global Edition* (July/August 2010).
- *IP Global Edition* (March/April 2010): articles by Riecke; Korski/Gowan; Weber/Bassuener
- “Charlemagne: Too Many Cooks,” *The Economist*, December 19th, 2009.

TAKING SIDES 3: Should the EU be able to do everything that NATO can?

AT ISSUE: CFSP: myth or reality? CSDP: NATO’s complement or competitor?

TRANSATLANTIC SECURITY ISSUES

WEEK 7: Domestic CT Responses

Thursday, October 13

- Dorle Hellmuth, “Taking Stock of Terrorism: The Bush Counterterrorism Legacy and Remaining Challenges for Obama,” (with Frank Gadinger) AICGS Policy Report #41 (Washington, DC: AICGS, December 2009).
- Tom Maley, “The London Terrorist Attacks of July 7, 2005,” in James Forest, ed, Countering Terrorism and Insurgency in the 21st Century (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2007).
- Jeremy Shapiro and Benedicte Suzan, “The French Experience of Counter-terrorism,” Survival 41, no. 1 (2003).
- Reuel Marc Gerech and Gary Schmitt, “What France Does Best,” The American (March/April 2008).
- Dorle Hellmuth, “German and U.S. Domestic Counterterrorism Responses: Only Half a World Apart,” AICGS Transatlantic Perspectives (Washington, DC: American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, June 2009).
- Javier Argomaniz, “The European Union Post 9/11 Counter-Terror Policy Response: An Overview,” Research Institute for European and American Studies (RIEAS) Research Paper No. 140 (February 2010).
- Oldrich Bures, “Europol’s Fledgling Counterterrorism Role,” Terrorism and Political Violence 20:4 (2008).

Recommended:

Europol, TE-SAT 2009: EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report (The Hague: EU, 2009).

EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy – Discussion Paper, May 10, 2010.

AT ISSUE: How do the US, France, Great Britain, Germany, etc. counter terrorism? What role for the European Union?

WEEK 8: CT Differences and Areas of Cooperation

Thursday, October 20

Data Privacy:

- Sophie in’t Veld, “Share Data – and Protect Rights,” Washington Post, September 9, 2006.
- Edna Dretzka and Annika Stormy-Mildner, “Anything but Swift: Why Data-Sharing is Still a Problem for the EU,” AICGS Issue Brief 35 (May 2010).
- Eleanor Zeff, “Power Plays: US War on Terrorism Versus EU Privacy Protection,” Georgetown University Case Study (2008).

Guantanamo/Renditions:

- James Lindsay and Ray Takeyh, “After Iran Gets the Bomb,” Foreign Affairs (March/April 2010).
- Michael Rühle, “The Bomb for Beginners,” IP Global Edition (March/April 2010).
- Graham Allison, “Nuclear Disorder,” Foreign Affairs (January/February 2010).
- Charles Ferguson, “The Long Road to Zero,” Foreign Affairs (January/February 2010).
- Benjamin Schreer and Patrick Keller, “Getting to Zero,” IP Global Edition (Jan/Feb 2010).
- Richard Lugar, “Redefining NATO’s Mission: WMD Terror Quarterly 25.3 (summer 2002).
- Tomas Valasek, “Obama's missile defense change shows different targets: Will the scrapped missile defense base soothe or incite Russia while defending against Iranian threat?” Yale Global, September 21, 2009.
- Kenneth Moss, “Defining Strategic Priorities: Ballistic Missile Defense, Iran, and Relations with Other Powers,” Mediterranean Quarterly 20.1 (winter 2009).

TAKING SIDES 4: How effective a tool is pre-emption in addressing WMD proliferation?

AT ISSUE: Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation issues; does Europe face the risk of a missile attack from Iran?

WEEK 10: The West, Turkey, and the Muslim World

Thursday, November 3

The Burqa & Muhammad & Mosque Debates:

- “On Faith: Limits to Religious Liberty,” Washington Post, May 8, 2010.
- Reza Aslan, “Depicting Muhammad,” Slate.com, February 8, 2006.
- US Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Foreign Media Reaction Early Report: Muhammad Cartoon Controversy, February 6/7, 2006.
- Stephen Walt, “Why America is Going to Regret the Cordoba House Controversy,” Foreign Policy, August 17, 2010.
- Kayvan Farzaneh, “Europe’s Burqa Wars,” Foreign Policy, August 18, 2010.
- Ayaan Hirsi Ali, Nomad (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010), pp. 13-22.
- “Beyond the Burqa,” Economist, May 13th, 2010.
- Justin Vaisse, “Muslims in Europe: A Short Introduction,” Brookings Report (Sept. 2008).
- Jonathan Laurence, “The US-EU Counter-Terrorism Conversation: Acknowledging a Two Way Threat,” Brookings US-Europe Analysis Series 44 (February 24, 2010).

Turkey

- Mustafa Alani, “Arab Perspectives on NATO,” NATO Review (spring 2005).
- Francis Ghilès, “Bridging Cultural Divisions,” NATO Review (spring 2005).
- Heinz Kramer, “Turkey’s Accession Process to the EU,” SWP Comments (October 2009).
- Joseph Joseph, “EU Enlargement: The Challenge and Promise of Turkey,” in *The Foreign Policy of the European Union*, ed. Federiga Bindi (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2010), pp. 155-168.
- David Phillips, “Turkey’s Dreams of Accession,” *Foreign Affairs* (September/October 2004).
- Wolfgang Schaeuble, “A Still-European Union,” *Foreign Affairs* (Nov/Dec 2004).
- Steven Cook, “Islamist Political Power in Turkey: Challenges for Brussels and Washington,” in *The Challenge Of Islamists for EU and US Policies: Conflict, Stability, and Reform*, ed. Muriel Asseburg and Daniel Brumberg, Joint Publication of SWP & United States Institute of Peace (November 2007).
- Muriel Asseburg, “The Challenge of Islamists: Elements of a Shared US-EU Agenda Towards the Muslim World,” in *The Challenge Of Islamists for EU and US Policies*, ed. Asseburg and Brumberg, SWP & USIP (November 2007).
- Didem Akyel, “What is Turkey Doing in the Middle East?” International Crisis Group, July 13, 2010.

Recommended:

- John Hulsman, “Jump Starting the Peace Process,” IP Global Edition (Spring 2009).
- Jolyon Howorth, “Time for the EU to Lead,” *Global Europe*, March 25, 2010.
- Muriel Asseburg, “The ESDP Missions in the Palestinian Territories: Peace Through Security,” in *The EU as a Strategic Actor in the Realm of Security and Defence?* SWP Research Paper, ed. Muriel Asseburg and Ronja Kempin (Berlin: SWP, 2009).
- Muriel Asseburg, “European Conflict Management in the Middle East: Toward a More Effective Approach,” *Carnegie Paper* (February 2009).
- Martin van Creveld, “NATO, Israel and Peace in the Middle East,” NATO Review (spring 2005).

AT ISSUE: Clash of civilizations? Western Muslim dilemmas; whither Turkey? US/EU conflict management in the Middle East.

WEEK 11: Atlantic Storm: Bio-Terrorism Exercise

Thursday, November 10

*****UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH PAPERS DUE AT THE BEGINNING OF CLASS*****

- Daniel Hamilton and Bradley Smith, “Atlantic Storm: Facing the Bioterror Challenge,” European Molecular Biology Organization Reports 7.1 (2006).
- Michael Moodie and Robert Armstrong, “Responding in the Homeland: A Snapshot of NATO’s Readiness for CBRN Attacks,” Defense Horizons 56 (Washington DC: NDU, 2007).
- Daniel Hamilton and Bradley Smith, “The Challenge of Bio-Terrorism,” in Transatlantic Homeland Security?, ed. Anja Dalgaard-Nielsen and Daniel Hamilton (New York: Routledge, 2006).

TAKING SIDES 5: Should NATO’s new function be counter-terrorism?

AT ISSUE: Transatlantic coordination mechanisms and emergency preparedness for bioterrorism.

WEEK 12: Russia, NATO, and Energy Security

Thursday, November 17

- Kupchan, Charles, “NATO’s Final Frontier,” Foreign Affairs 89.3 (May/Jun2010).
- “It’s Time to Invite Russia to Join NATO,” Spiegel Online, 8 March, 2010.
- Alexander Rahr, “Reaching Out to Russia,” IP Global Edition (spring 2009).
- European Union, Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Conflict in Georgia, Final Report, September 30, 2009, summary.
- “I call that hypocrisy.” Interview with Russia’s NATO Ambassador Dmitry Rogozin, IP Global Edition (March/April 2010).
- James Kirchick, “Letter from Tbilisi,” Foreign Affairs (July 2010).
- Dimitri Trenin, “Russia’s Dance with NATO,” Moscow Times, April 2010.
- Peter Rudolf, “Towards a Common Transatlantic Strategy in Dealing with Russia?” SWP Comments (October 2008).
- Tomas Valasek, “NATO, Russia, and European Security,” Centre for European Reform (November 2009).
- Keith Smith, Russia and European Energy Security, CSIS, October 2008.
- Kirsten Westphal, “Russian Gas, Ukrainian Pipelines, and European Supply Security” Lessons from 2009,” SWP Research Paper 11 (September 2009).
- Vladimir Socor, Russian President Medvedev Submits Draft Treaty on European Security Architecture,” Eurasia Daily Monitor 6.224 (December 7, 2009).
- “A New European Order?” GMFUS Brussels Forum Paper Series (2010).

Recommended:

- United States House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, “Transatlantic Security in the 21st Century: Do New Threats Require New Approaches?” March 17, 2010, testimonies by Dimitri Trenin, Wolfgang Ischinger, and Sally McNamara.

AT ISSUE: European dependence on Russian energy; Russia as a future NATO member?

WEEK 13: THANKSGIVING, NO CLASS THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 24

WEEK 14: Quo Vadis, NATO?

Thursday, December 1

- Andrew Bacevich, “Let Europe Be Europe: Why the United States Must Withdraw from NATO,” *Foreign Policy* (March/April 2010).
- Daniel Korski, “Partners in Decline,” (A Rebuttal to Bacevich), *Foreign Policy* online (March 2, 2010).
- Karl-Heinz Kamp, “NATO after Afghanistan,” *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings* 136.6 (June 2010).
- Emiliano Alessandri, “Global NATO,” *Policy World* (February 2009).
- David Yost, “Assurance and US Extended Deterrence in NATO,” *International Affairs* 85.4 (2009).
- Ronald Asmus, et al. “NATO, New Allies, and Reassurance,” *Centre for European Reform* (May 2010).
- Pal Johnson, “The Debate about Article 5 and its Credibility,” *NATO Research Paper* 58 (May 2010).
- NATO 2020: Assured Security; Dynamic Engagement, Analysis and Recommendations of the Group of Experts on a New Strategic Concept for NATO, May 17, 2010.
- The Washington NATO Project, *Alliance Reborn: An Atlantic Compact for the 21st Century*, Executive Summary, January 30, 2010.
- Department of Defense: NATO Strategic Concept Seminar (Future of NATO), Remarks by Robert M. Gates, National Defense University, Washington, D.C., February 23, 2010.
- Responses by Kori Shake, Jackson Janes, Stephen Szabo, Almut Moeller, Ulrike Guerot, Olaf Theiler, Judy Dempsey.

TAKING SIDES 6: How global a role can and should NATO play?

At ISSUE: NATO’s 2010 Strategic Concept (e.g. global NATO; Article 5; extended deterrence); future of transatlantic relations.

WEEK 15: Assessment and Conclusion

Thursday, December 8

- Daniel Hamilton and Frances Burwell, *Shoulder to Shoulder: Forging a Strategic U.S.-EU Partnership* (Washington DC: ACUS et al., 2009).
- Parag Khanna, "Europe 2030: A Postmodern Middle Ages," IP Global Edition (summer 2009).
- Wolfram Eilenberger, "Europe 2030: Candide's Garden," IP Global Edition (summer 2009).
- Daniel Keohane and Tomas Valasek, "Willing and Able? Europe's Defence in 2020," Centre for European Reform (June 2008).
- Hubert Vedrine, "Europe and the United States in 2030," in *Europe 2030*, ed. Daniel Benjamin (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2010).

At ISSUE: Quo Vadis, Transatlantis?

*****FINAL GRADUATE RESEARCH PAPER DUE:, 10:00 PM EMAIL TO
@AMERICAN.EDU*****