Grading Guidance

1. Discuss realism as an explanatory theory of security and defence policy. What are its limitations? What are its strengths? Illustrate with empirical examples.

We have discussed realism as a theory of security policy in class, in my lecture on theory, as well as in the lecture by Naterstad on Ukraine, and in the introductory and summary lectures. Realism is very well presented in the Collins reading and I have emphasized its importance, strengths and weaknesses, and underlined that mainstream theories are the ones to concentrate mostly on, despite the need to be familiar with all the chapters on theory in Collins. Thus, the student should know about offensive and defensive realism, the main theoretical tenets of all realist theory (anarchy, importance of power, balancing, bandwagooning, Walz, Walt vs Mearsheimer, etc). They should also have noted the inherent difficulty in applying a set of ideas (realism) rather than a specified theory to empirical examples, - like liberalism, realism is a 'big bag' of assumptions and hypotheses, not a mid-range or unit level theory. Caveats in application must therefore be made, but then it is possible to discuss explanatory value grosso modo. The question asks for illustrations, not case studies – the focus is thus mainly on analysis and discussion of this theory tradition, and in the course of that, use of illustrations that may be historical and contemporary. I have mentioned that realism seems to explain Russian revisionism, whereas liberal theory would seem fruitful in explaining Europe's stances and responses. – A good exam would may also discuss whether NATO as a defensive alliance can respond to Russia in terms of deterrence, i.e. can offensive realism on Russia's part be met with defensive realism on our part.

2. The Role of NATO: Deterrence is back while enlargement to democratic states remains important. Discuss the types of security policies and **deterrence approaches** that NATO pursues. Which **concepts and** theories may help us analyze them?

This questions contains several: how does NATO act in security policy, how does it deter, and how can we analyse these actions by way of theories and concepts? ***– Security policy*** *is comprehensive; partnership policy and enlargement, aiming to democratize defence policy and the countries in question (NATO's treaty is based on these values and principles). Security policy thus encompasses much more than deterrence. – On the latter, we have conventional and nuclear deterrence. On conventional, I have a lecture, and Do Young gave the lecture on nuclear deterrence, with readings that provide a solid basis for discussing both types of deterrence. Conventional relates to the main work that NATO now undertakes, the Defend and Deter policy and new military plans, and the students have read the latest Strategic Concept of NATO. We have also discussed the known (unclassified) military plans for enhancing posture to East-Central Europe, etc. On nuclear, Do Young has presented the dilemmas of nuclear deterrence in an age of Trump, where the question is much like in the Cold War: Will the US risk NY for Berlin? This leads to consideration of European nuclear deterrence, i.e. France and the UK. The student should know about the major dilemmas of nuclear deterrence under today's proliferation.*

On concepts and theories, deterrence comes in two types, denial and punishment. These are cold war concepts from cold war theories, which proliferated then, but are perhaps not relevant now? Some consideration of this is a plus. Denial deterrence is extremely costly, especially in

Europe, therefore there is some mix of denial and punishment in the Baltics, whereas Poland takes it upon itself to arm up to denial mode. On nuclear, it is about punishment. A good exam would highlight these issues and show some knowledge of theories of nuclear deterrence, I em readings for Do Young's lecture.