

Irregular Warfare
MA Option – Department of International Relations
University of Sussex

Instructor: Dr. Sergio Catignani

Email: s.catignani@sussex.ac.uk

Tutorials: Mondays 9:00-11:00 am

Tel: 01273 877212

Room: Fulton 103, Fulton Bldg

Office Hours: Mondays 11:15-12:15 & by

Office: Arts B377

appointment.

Description

The general aim of this course is to provide students with a strong foundation in the conceptual, strategic and ethical issues related to irregular warfare. Whilst looking at in-depth historical case studies of irregular warfare, the course will reveal how varieties of irregular warfare have risen to prominence during the twentieth century. This course will, in particular, trace the evolutionary phases of insurgency and counter-insurgency from the Maoist version of the “people’s war” in China to the development of global *jihad*. The course will particularly focus on the dilemmas and problems that conventional militaries have faced in trying to adapt to irregular warfare and explore the issue of whether or not the military is the *ideal* instrument in defeating insurgencies. This course, furthermore, aims to familiarise students to the sub-types of irregular warfare.

It is useful to have a basic knowledge of twentieth century history, as this will comprise some of the case study subject matter discussed in this seminar, but this is not indispensable as background readings will be provided for any of the cases examined.

Objectives

On completion of this course students will demonstrate, amongst other things:

- A comprehensive understanding of the conceptual issues associated with the definition and study of irregular warfare, and particularly, of insurgency and counter-insurgency.

- An awareness of the competing theories and practices of irregular warfare.
- An understanding of the kinds of predicaments, including political and ethical dilemmas, produced by irregular warfare activities.
- Develop key research as well as written and oral skills through research papers and oral presentations in the seminar programme.

Lecture/Seminar Session Themes

- Week 2 (16 January) - Introduction to course syllabus, definitions of irregular warfare, insurgency and terrorism.
- Week 3 (23 January) - Classic theories of insurgency/guerrilla war.
- Week 4 (30 January) - Classic theories of counter-insurgency.
- Week 5 (6 February) – Changing Nature of insurgent and counter-insurgent warfare.
- Week 6 (13 February) - Asian Case Studies: Malaya and Vietnam.
- Week 7 (20 February) - Caucasus Case Studies: Afghanistan (1979-89) and Chechnya (1994-96; 1999-Present).
- Week 8 (27 February) - Middle East Case Studies: Algeria, Israel/Lebanon and Israel/Palestine.
- Week 9 (5 March) - *Al-Qaeda*: a global jihadist insurgency?
- Week 10 (12 March) - Contemporary Case Studies: Afghanistan, Iraq and the Global War on Terror.

Methods of Instruction

This course is based on active student participation regardless of the specific session's format. I see myself as a facilitator of your learning experience during this course. I do not have all the answers to the questions and dilemmas raised in this course. I will contribute with my expertise, of course, but I strongly encourage students to develop their own analytical skills by not only challenging much of the received wisdom about how to think about irregular warfare, but also by challenging my own expertise on this subject by engaging critically at all times the vast literature on this subject as well as the specific empirical case studies of irregular warfare.

Students are encouraged to ask generic questions that would normally constitute a “frequently asked question” in class or on the course discussion forum provided by [Study Direct](#), so that

everyone may benefit from my answer. Those wishing to discuss personal matters or ask questions specifically relating to their coursework or course assessments or any other issue may do so during my office hours or by appointment.

Format

The course will be divided into one two-hour tutorial session each week.

The tutorial session will run on a seminar discussion format whereby selected students will initially provide oral presentations. Such presentations will normally take up the first half-hour of the tutorial and will address the main issues and provide a general overview of the topic for that particular week's discussion.

Presentations should demonstrate the student's ability to critically engage the readings and not merely summarize the reading material. Presentations will be assessed by the course convenor. The assessment criteria for oral presentations can be viewed in the **Appendix**. Feedback on the oral assessment will be given to the student(s) by the end of the week in which they present (i.e., by the Friday).

Following the student presentations a structured discussion will take place under the moderation of both the presenters and the course instructor. All students will carry out general background reading prior to the seminar and will be encouraged to participate actively in the tutorial discussion following the student presentations.

Occasionally some variation will occur in the teaching/learning format. An illustrative film may be viewed outside the normal two-hour tutorial (e.g., *Battle of Algiers*, *Beaufort*, etc.). This film will reflect upon central themes and issues related to the course and also illustrate crucial background events.

Study Material

Literature (approx. 1000 pp.)

Students will be required to purchase one core textbook prior to the start of the seminar:

- Daniel Marston & Carter Malkasian (eds.), *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010; paperback). Available from <http://www.amazon.co.uk>.

Further reading will be available through the electronic journals database, the online PDF-based course study pack and the university library. Please note that all journal reading assignments are downloadable from the university's library online journals catalogue. I have not included such journal articles in the study pack as including them would have made the study pack huge.

Students, in any case, are strongly encouraged to make full use of the resources available in the library and online that go beyond the course reading assignments. The reading assignments listed below satisfy the minimal reading requirements for this course and whilst not all publications will be discussed during the seminar, they will provide the student a basic understanding of the issues and historical events relating to the topics addressed during the course.

Participation

It is expected that all students attend all seminars and participate actively in seminar discussions (both attendance and participation will be monitored and will also provide the basis on which I will decide whether or not to write you a letter of recommendation at the end of your studies, should you ask for one). If for legitimate reasons in your work or personal life you are unable to attend certain seminars, then you should contact your tutor beforehand or as soon as possible after your absence by email. More than three unjustified absences may result in disciplinary action.

Methods of Assessment

This course provides the basis for continuous assessment. Students will be required to give an **oral presentation** on one of the seminar topics during Weeks 3 to 10. You will be required to express a first and second choice regarding the presentation topic you would like to present on by the Wednesday of Week 2 on the Study Direct Discussion Forum. I will then proceed to allocate your presentation topic by the Thursday of Week 2. **This presentation assessment**

counts for **15% of the mark awarded for this course**. The presentations will be recorded via digital recorder for auditing the marking carried out with this assessment.

Students will also be required to hand in **the week following the session in which they gave their oral presentation** a **1,000-word research brief** based on the same seminar question they presented on. Additionally, you should hand in **2 copies of the same essay to the Global Studies office (C168) by 4:00 pm on Monday 16 April** with a cover sheet which is available from the school office (I will explain during our first seminar why this resubmission is necessary). Late submissions will be graded as a FAIL, unless justified by a major emergency (e.g., death in the family, debilitating illness, etc). **This 1000-word assessment counts for 25% of the mark awarded for this course.**

Students will be required, by the start of the summer term, to write a **3,000-word research paper** on one of the seminar discussion questions other than the one presented on. Alternatively, students are permitted to set their own question related to some theme on irregular warfare only through prior approval by the course instructor.

The **research paper** will need to be submitted by **Monday 16 April 2012, 4.00pm to the Global Studies office (C168)**. You should hand in 2 copies of your essay with a cover sheet which is available from the school office. Late submissions will be graded as a FAIL, unless justified by a major emergency (e.g., death in the family, debilitating illness, etc).

Both written assessments will need to engage the vast literature on irregular warfare addressed in this course. As a rule of thumb, the research brief will need to relate to at least 5 bibliographical sources, whereas the research paper will need to relate to at least 12 bibliographical sources. Please see **Appendix** below for the **MA Marking Criteria**. **This assessment counts for 60% of the mark awarded for this course.**

Students have the opportunity to write a short essay outline of 250-500 words and to seek some guidance by the course instructor during his office hours before progressing with their 3,000-word research paper during the spring teaching term. However, the course instructor cannot review full or partial drafts as this would bestow an unfair advantage on students seeking such help.

Please note:

- Papers must be referenced and have a bibliography in a recognised format. Papers without either of these components will lose marks accordingly.
- On the execution of written work (but also on other useful matters for organising study and preparation) you can read from the extensive material in the Palgrave Online section on Study Skills at <http://www.palgrave.com/skills4study/>

Possible Research-Brief/Paper & Seminar Discussion Questions**Week 2 (16 January)**

1. *What are the conceptual problems with the terms 1) insurgency 2) terrorism 3) low-intensity conflict?*
2. *Discuss the view that notions of conventional and unconventional war are unhelpful and artificial intellectual divisions?*
3. *Can we define irregular warfare?*

Week 3 (23 January)

1. *Did Maoist guerrilla strategy have any wider applicability to insurgent conflicts beyond China?*
2. *The strengths and weaknesses of irregular warfare: is it better than regular warfare?*

Week 4 (30 January)

1. *'To implement a successful counter-insurgent strategy all one must do is reverse the principles of guerrilla warfare'. Assess whether this is an accurate statement.*
2. *Can an insurgency be defeated?*
3. *Assess the development of the theory and practice of French colonial warfare as developed by those like Trinquier and Galula.*

Week 5 (6 February)

1. *Why does irregular warfare develop?*
2. *Has the nature of irregular warfare (insurgency in particular) changed since 9/11?*
3. *Why did irregular warfare come to dominate conflict after 1945?*

Week 6 (13 February)

1. *Assess the British counter-insurgency effort in Malaya.*
2. “[T]he United States can look back on Vietnam as the wrong war – at the wrong place, at the wrong time, with the wrong army” – Andrew F. Krepinevich, *The Army and Vietnam* (JHU Press, 1988), p. 4. *Assess Krepinevich’s statement on the basis of the US counter-insurgency effort in Vietnam. Discuss, furthermore, why the US military struggled to learn lessons from its campaign in Indochina.*

Week 7 (20 February)

1. *What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Soviet approach to counter-insurgency in Afghanistan? How effective were the Mujahideen guerrilla operations against Soviet occupation?*
2. *What factors brought an end to Soviet occupation?*

Week 8 (27 February)

1. *‘The ends justified the means’. Is this a verdict that applied to the strategies of both the French and the FLN?*
2. *Why, and with what consequences, did the Palestinians embark on the strategy of ‘Intifadas’?*

Week 9 (5 March)

1. *Was the threat posed to the international system by Islamic extremism ignored. If so why?*
2. *Is the notion of the ‘global insurgency’ as a metaphor for the current threat posed by Islamists accurate?*
3. *Is the perceived threat of Al-Qaeda disproportionate to its actual capabilities?*

Week 10 (12 March)

1. *Account for the counter-insurgency record of the U.S. and international coalition forces during the Afghan and/or Iraqi interventions after 9/11.*
2. *Can the GWOT be won through military intervention in so-called failing/failed states?*

Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism and Collusion)

“It is an offence for any student to be guilty of, or party to, attempting to commit or committing collusion, plagiarism, or any other misconduct in an examination or in the preparation of work which is submitted for assessment. Misconduct in assessment exercises, examinations or in the presentation of marks achieved elsewhere, is conduct likely to be prejudicial to the integrity and fairness of the examination process.”

The **University of Sussex** uses the following definition of plagiarism for the purposes of Academic Misconduct procedures.

*“**Plagiarism** is the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of other people, and the act of representing the ideas or discoveries of another as one's own in written work submitted for assessment. To copy sentences, phrases or even striking expressions without acknowledgement of the source (either by inadequate citation or failure to indicate verbatim quotations), is plagiarism; to paraphrase without acknowledgement is likewise plagiarism. Where such copying or paraphrase has occurred the mere mention of the source in the bibliography shall not be deemed sufficient acknowledgement; each such instance must be referred specifically to its source. Verbatim quotations must be either in inverted commas, or indented, and directly acknowledged.”*

Both students and staff should familiarize themselves with this information, so that it is clearly understood what is and is not acceptable. Further information on the University of Sussex Academic Misconduct procedures can be found [here](#).

Topics and Readings

Week 2 – Introduction to course syllabus & “Definitions of irregular warfare, insurgency and terrorism; evolution and the legitimacy of warfare and political violence”.

- Carl Von Clausewitz, Chapter 1 “What is War?” (Pdf uploaded on Study Direct).
- Colin S. Gray, Chapter 18, “Irregular warfare: Guerrillas, insurgents and terrorists” in *War, Peace and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History* (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 245-263.

Week 3 – Classic theories of insurgency/guerrilla war

- Ian F.W. Beckett, Chapter 4, “Mao Tse-Tung and Revolutionary Warfare” in *Modern Insurgencies and Counter-Insurgencies: Guerrillas and their Opponents since 1750* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 70-85.
- Mao Tse-Tung, *On Guerrilla Warfare* (Excerpts).
- Che Guevara, “The Essence of Guerrilla Struggle” in (ed.) David Deutschmann, *Che Guevara Reader* (Hoboken, NJ: Ocean Press, 1997), pp. 66-72.
- Matt D. Childs, “An Historical Critique of the Emergence and Evolution of Ernesto Che Guevara’s Foco Theory”, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (October 1995), pp. 593-624.

Week 4 – Theories and Practices of Counterinsurgency

- Chapter 5 – “Counterinsurgency in the Hot Revolutionary War” in *Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice* by David Galula ([e-copy available in Sussex University Library](#)).
- Roger Trinquier, *Modern Warfare: A French View of Counterinsurgency* (London: Praeger, 1964), 74 pp.
- Frank Kitson, Chapter 3 – “Civil Military Relations”, *Low Intensity Operations: Subversion, Insurgency, Peace-Keeping* (Natraj Publishers, 1992), pp. 48-63.
- Michael G. Findley & Joseph K. Young, “Fighting Fire with Fire? How (Not) to Neutralize an Insurgency”, *Civil Wars*, Vol.9, No.4 (December 2007), pp. 378-401.
- David J. Kilcullen, “Countering Global Insurgency”, *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 4 (August 2005), pp. 597-617.

Week 5 – The changing nature of insurgent and counter-insurgent warfare.

- John Arquilla, “The end of war as we knew it? Insurgency, counterinsurgency and lessons from the forgotten history of early terror networks”, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (March 2007), pp 369-386.
- Don D. Chipman, “Osama bin Laden and Guerrilla War”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (May 2003), pp. 163-170.

- Rupert Smith, Chapter 7, “Trends: Our Modern Operations” in *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World* (London: Penguin, 2006), pp. 267-305.

Week 6 – Asian Case Studies: Malaya & Vietnam.

Malaya

- Richard Stubbs, Chapter 6, “From Search and Destroy to Hearts and Minds: The Evolution of British Strategy in Malaya 1948-60” in D. Marston & C. Malkasian (eds.) *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010).
- John Nagl, Chapter 5, “The Empire Strikes Back: British Army Counterinsurgency in Malaya, 1952-1957” in *Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam: Learning to Eat Soup with a Knife* (London: Praeger, 2002), pp.87-111.

Vietnam

- Ian F.W. Beckett, Chapter 8, “Insurgency and the Superpowers” in *Modern Insurgencies and Counter-Insurgencies: Guerrillas and their Opponents since 1750* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 183-216. **(Focus on Vietnam).**
- Ivan Arreguín-Toft, Chapter 6, “The United States in Vietnam: the Vietnam War, 1965-1973” in *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 144-168.
- John A. Nagl, Chapter 7, “Counterinsurgency in Vietnam: American Organizational Culture and Learning” in D. Marston & C. Malkasian (eds.) *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010).

Week 7 – Caucasus Case Studies: Afghanistan (1979-89) & Chechnya (1994-96; 1999-Present).

Afghanistan

- Robert Cassidy, Chapter 3, “Russian Military Culture and Counterinsurgency: Pavlov Meets Jihad”, in *Counterinsurgency and the Global War on Terror: Military Culture and Irregular War* (London: Praeger Security International, 2006), pp. 37-71.
- Lester Grau, “The Soviet-Afghan War: A Superpower Mired in the Mountains”, *Journal of Military Slavic Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (March 2004), pp. 129-151.

Chechnya

- Mark Kramer, “The Perils of Counterinsurgency: Russia’s War in Chechnya”, *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Winter 2004/05), pp. 5–63.
- James Hughes, “Chechnya: The causes of a protracted post-soviet conflict”, *Civil Wars*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Winter 2001), pp. 11-48.

Week 8 – Middle East Case Studies: Algeria & Israel/Palestine.

Israel/Palestine

- Sergio Catignani, Chapter 11, “The Israel Defense Forces and the *Al-Aqsa Intifada*: When Tactical Virtuosity Meets Strategic Disappointment” in D. Marston & C. Malkasian (eds.) *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010).
- Ruth Margolies Beitler, “The *Intifada*: Palestinian adaptation to Israeli counterinsurgency tactics”, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Summer 1995), pp. 49-73.
- Hillel Frisch, “Debating Palestinian Strategy in the *al-Aqsa Intifada*, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol.15, No.2 (Summer 2003), pp. 61-80.

Algeria

- Douglas Porch, Chapter 5, “French Imperial Warfare 1945-1962” in D. Marston & C. Malkasian (eds.) *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010).
- Martin S. Alexander & J. F. V. Keiger, “France and the Algerian War: strategy, operations and diplomacy”, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vo. 25, No. 2 (June 2002), pp. 1-32.

Week 9 – *Al-Qaeda*: a global jihadist insurgency?

- John Arquilla, “The end of war as we knew it? Insurgency, counterinsurgency and lessons from the forgotten history of early terror networks”, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (March 2007), pp. 369-386.
- Mark Sedgwick, “Al-Qaeda and the Nature of Religious Terrorism”, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol.16, No.4 (Winter 2004), pp.795-814.

- Don D. Chipman, “Osama bin Laden and Guerrilla War”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (May 2003), pp. 163-170.
- Jean-Pierre Filiu, “The Local and Global Jihad of al-Qa‘ida in the Islamic Maghrib”, *The Middle East Journal*, Volume 63, Number 2, Spring 2009, pp. 213-226.

Week 10 – Contemporary Case Studies: Afghanistan, Iraq and the Global War on Terror.

Iraq

- Carter Malkasian, “Counterinsurgency in Iraq: May 2003-January 2010” in D. Marston & C. Malkasian (eds.) *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010).
- Kalev I. Sepp, “From 'shock and awe' to 'hearts and minds': the fall and rise of US counterinsurgency capability in Iraq”, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2, March 2007, pp. 217-230.

Afghanistan

- Astri Suhrke, “A Contradictory Mission? NATO from Stabilization to Combat in Afghanistan”, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol.15, No.2, April 2008, pp.214–236.
- Daniel Marston, Chapter 12, “Realizing the Extent of our Errors and Forging the Road Ahead: Afghanistan 2001-2010” in D. Marston & C. Malkasian (eds.) *Counterinsurgency in Modern Warfare* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010).

Select Journals on University Library E-Journals Database and Useful Journal Website Links

Adelphi Papers

Comparative Strategy

Conflict Management & Peace Science

Conflict Resolution Quarterly

Diplomatic History

International Affairs

International Organization

International Security

[Joint Forces Quarterly](#)

The Journal of Conflict Resolution

Journal of Contemporary History

Journal of Strategic Studies

[Military Review](#) (Click on English Edition on left-side of screen to get current and past issues)

[Parameters](#) (*US Army War College Quarterly*)

Security Dialogue

Security Studies

Small Wars & Insurgencies

[Small Wars Journal](#)

Strategic Survey

Studies in Conflict and Terrorism

Survival

Third World Quarterly

Useful websites:

Students are expected to explore relevant web resources for themselves (but always be critical about the quality and bias of what they encounter). Recommended sites include:

- *Complex Terrain Laboratory*: <http://www.terraplexic.org/>
- *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute*: <http://www.sipri.org/>

- *Combating Terrorism Centre (Westpoint): <http://ctc.usma.edu/sentinel/>*
- *UK Defence Academy: <http://www.da.mod.uk/podcasts>*
- *'MERLIN' US National Defence University: <http://merln.ndu.edu/>*
- *US Institute of Peace: <http://www.usip.org/>*
- *Institute for War and Peace Reporting: <http://www.iwpr.org>*
- *US Army War College: <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/>*
- *International Studies Association web resources: <http://www.isanet.org/links/>*
- *US Naval Postgraduate School: <http://www.nps.edu/>*
- *US Homeland Security: <http://www.inhomelandsecurity.com/>*
- *UK Resilience (Cabinet Office Civil Contingencies Secretariat):*
<http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/ukresilience.aspx>
- *RAND Corps: <http://www.rand.org/>*
- *Center for Strategic and International Studies: <http://csis.org/>*
- *Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies: <http://www.rusi.org>*
- *Chatham House (Royal Institute for International Affairs): <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk>*
- *International Institute for Strategic Studies: <http://www.iiss.org>*
- *Brookings Institute: <http://www.brookings.edu/>*
- *Arms Control Resources: <http://www.armscontrol.org/>*
- *Bitter Lemons: <http://www.bitterlemons.org/>*
- *Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies: <http://www.ciss.ca/>*
- *Centre for Defence Information (good on proliferation issues etc): <http://www.cdi.org/>*
- *CIA Factbook: <http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/>*
- *Human Rights Watch <http://www.hrw.org/>*
- *International Crisis Group: <http://www.icg.org/home/index.cfm>*
- *Institute for National Security Studies [Israeli-focused]: <http://www.inss.org.il/>*
- *Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies [Israeli-focused]: <http://www.biu.ac.il/Besa/>*
- *Institute for Palestine Studies: <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/palestine/>*
- *Rand Corporation: <http://www.rand.org/>*
- *Council on Foreign Relations: <http://www.cfr.org/>*

MA ASSESSMENT CRITERIA
Presentations
Oral Presentation Feedback Sheet*

Student Name:

Date:

Presentation title:

Criteria and prompt questions	Fail	Pass	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
<i>Critical Understanding</i>					
Does the presentation demonstrate the student's ability to critically engage and analyze the literature and ability to apply it in order to answer the discussion question?					
<i>Audibility</i>					
Can the presentation be heard clearly throughout?					
<i>Pace</i>					
Is the pace of the speech, or flow of ideas, too fast or too slow?					
<i>Fluency</i>					
Is the speech pattern fluent, indicating familiarity with the material?					
<i>Body Language and Gesture</i>					
Is the presenter's posture upright and confident? Does their movement and gesture enhance, not distract from, what they are saying? Is the presenter making eye contact across the audience and avoiding becoming note-bound?					
<i>Appropriateness to the Audience</i>					
Is the content and approach relevant, interesting and engaging?					
<i>Structure and Cohesion</i>					
Was the structure clearly outlined? Is the order logical and easy to follow? Is it signposted throughout? Is the balance of various elements effective? Is timing accurate?					
<i>Use of Visual Aids</i>					
Is there a suitable amount? Are they easy to read? Do they effectively support the oral delivery? Does the presenter use them competently?					

Comments

***This feedback sheet is mostly based on the resource , which was created by Kate Ippolito from the LearnHigher CETL at Brunel University and is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 Licence -**

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.0/uk/>

Written Assignments

Descriptor	Alpha Scale	%	Criteria
Excellent	A+	95	is awarded for work of exceptional quality based on a comprehensive knowledge of the chosen topic, a sustained high level of critical analysis combined with a genuine originality of approach. The essay or dissertation will be tightly argued, meticulously organised, extremely well documented and will approach, in principle, publishable standard.
	A	90	is awarded when candidates show evidence of extensive relevant reading, a significant grasp of current major issues in the field and offer an original approach to their chosen topic. This knowledge will have been reviewed critically and with sufficient insight to challenge received ideas. The arguments will be clearly and persuasively put.
	A-	85	
Good	B+	80	is awarded when candidates show consistency and fluency in discussing and evaluating evidence and theories from a wide range of sources. They will demonstrate an ability to relate this reading to their chosen topic and will clearly have understood and assimilated the relevant literature. The argument will be clear and well structured.
	B	75	
	B-	70	
Satisfactory	C+	65	is awarded when there is clear evidence of knowledge and understanding but where ideas, critical comment or methodology are under-developed or oversimplified. There may be room for significant improvement in the clarity and structure of the argument and although there will be appropriate reference to relevant reading, this may not be sufficiently extensive. Some irrelevancy may be present.
	C	60	
	C-	55	
Pass	D +	50	This is a pass. It is awarded for work that exhibits some knowledge of the chosen topic, but displays weaknesses of understanding and thoroughness. Arguments will be weakly structured and important information and references may be lacking. There may be a considerable proportion that is irrelevant
	D	45	
	D	40	

Fail	E +	35	This indicates a fail. It is awarded to work that is seriously flawed, displaying a lack of awareness of essential texts and incoherent arguments. The research involved may be poorly organised and inadequately discussed, offering a fundamentally inadequate response to the chosen topic. Large parts of the answer may be irrelevant
	E	15	
	F	0	Work not submitted. Fail.