

WAR AND PEACE

PSC 3240 – Fall 2022

University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Thursday, 10:50am – 1:30pm
Columbine Hall 103

Professor: Dr. David Arceneaux
E-mail: garcenea@uccs.edu
Office: ACAD 230
Office Hours: by appointment only

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course serves as an introduction to the political science subfield of international security. In this class, students will learn major concepts and theories related to the causes, conduct, and consequences of war in the international system.

The course contains four major sections. First, the course covers foundational concepts necessary for studying international security. Second, the course discusses major theories for the causes of interstate war. Third, the course broadens to discuss different aspects of military power, such as coercive diplomacy, nuclear weapons, and military effectiveness. Fourth, the course covers issues in asymmetric conflict, including counterinsurgency and civil wars.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

- Apply political science concepts, theories, and/or philosophies to explain current political issues and policy debates
- Evaluate political research and evaluate the extent to which arguments are well-reasoned and/or empirically supported
- Gather, critically analyze, and evaluate quantitative or qualitative information within relevant disciplinary contexts
- Communicate through a prepared and purposeful presentation
- Demonstrate the core ethical principles and responsible methods in the study of international politics

COURSE AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

GRADING POLICY

In the case of grading disputes, students must e-mail the professor a 100- to 500-word written rationale for the dispute within 48 hours of receiving the contested grade to request clarification and reevaluation. If the instructor deems the justification for re-grading as compelling, the instructor will then re-grade the disputed work and may assign a grade that is higher, lower, or the same as the original.

EXTRA CREDIT POLICY

There are no extra credit opportunities for this course. All requests for extra credit will be denied by the professor. There will be no exceptions to this policy.

LATE ASSIGNMENT POLICY

Assignments that are turned in 1 minute to 24 hours late after their due date will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade. Assignments will be marked down a full letter grade for each additional 24-hour period they are late. Assignments will not be accepted more than 72 hours after the due date.

When submitting assignments electronically, it is the student's responsibility to ensure that the correct file is attached and submitted on time. Failing to attach a file or attaching the wrong file will result in a penalty as identified above. Students should also adopt the practice of saving files on multiple platforms, as corrupted files, crashed computers, etc. will not be exempted from the late assignment policy.

TECHNOLOGY POLICY

The use of cell phones during class is prohibited. Students using cell phones will be asked to leave class for the day and will receive a 0 for that day's attendance.

Students may use laptops and tablets for readings or note-taking. However, if a student is using their laptop for purposes not related to class (social media, e-mail, etc.), that student will be asked to leave class for the day and will receive a 0 for that day's attendance.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The University of Colorado, Colorado Springs academic honor code holds students accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. The university policy governs several forms of academic dishonesty, including plagiarism, cheating, fabrication and falsification, multiple submission, misuse of academic materials, and complicity in academic dishonesty. The presumptive penalty for a first offense by an undergraduate student is course failure, accompanied by a transcript notation indicating that the failure resulted from a violation of the academic integrity policy. Students should be familiar with the policy and know that it is their responsibility to learn about course-specific expectations, as well as about university policy.

DISABILITY-RELATED ACCOMMODATIONS

If you are a student with a disability and believe you will need accommodations for this class, it is your responsibility to register with Disability Services and provide them with documentation of your disability. They will work with you to determine what accommodations are appropriate for your situation. To avoid any delay, you should contact Disability Services as soon as possible. Please note that accommodations are not retroactive and disability accommodations cannot be provided until a Faculty Accommodation Letter has been given to the professor. Please contact Disability Services for more information at Main Hall, room 105, 719-255-3354, or dservice@uccs.edu.

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE POLICY

The University of Colorado, Colorado Springs upholds the principle that a climate of respect for cultural and ideological diversity extends to the diversity of religious practices observed by members of our campus community. The religious observance policy protects the rights of students, faculty, and staff to observe religious holidays according to their tradition. Students are required to provide advance notification—preferably during the first week of classes—to the professor regarding necessary absences for religious or spiritual observances. Students are responsible for making up any work or exams according to an agreed-upon schedule between the student and professor.

COVID-19 POLICIES

Students in this class are expected to adhere to university policies regarding COVID-19 mitigation strategies. Students that refuse to comply with university policies will be dismissed from class without credit for attendance. A refusal to comply will also result in additional disciplinary action in accordance with the student code of conduct.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

BOOKS

The following books are required for this course:

Fred Charles Iklé, *Every War Must End*, 2d ed. (New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 2005).

Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 2008).

GRADING

Grades are comprised of six components:

Participation	25%
Reading questions	10%
Response paper 1	15%
Response paper 2	15%
Crisis simulation exercise	10%
Crisis simulation paper	25%

PARTICIPATION (25%)

As an upper-division course, this class is reading intensive. The course is built around readings and discussion, rather than lecture. Accordingly, active participation is required to accomplish the objectives of the course. Students are expected to read all material before each class and arrive prepared to actively discuss the readings. Students will be graded for each class on the following scale:

3 points	Thoughtful engagement with readings and class discussion
2 points	Satisfactory participation and engagement
1 point	Present for class, but lack of preparation and engagement
0 points	Absent or dismissed from class

Please note that attendance is a necessary but not sufficient condition for participation scores. All students will be given one (1) free absence from the course without question. For students seeking additional excused absences, however, those absences must be reported within 24 hours of the class period, if possible, and accompanied by documentation to justify the excuse (e.g., doctor's note, confirmation of court date, etc.).

READING QUESTIONS (10%)

Before each class, students are required to submit two reading questions via Canvas. These questions should engage the readings directly and serve as useful points of discussion during class. These questions should engage the concepts, arguments, and/or evidence presented in the readings.

Reading questions are due via by 8:00am MT on the day of class. Because students' questions will be used to structure class discussion, reading questions will not be accepted after the beginning of class. Questions received after the submission deadline but before the beginning of class will immediately lose 1 point from the scale below. Questions will be graded on the following scale:

- 2 points Clear and substantive engagement with readings
- 1 point Generally relevant questions, but lack of direct engagement with readings
- 0 points Failure to submit questions or no obvious engagement with readings

RESPONSE PAPERS (30%)

Each student will complete two short written assignments during the course that engage with the assigned readings. Each essay is worth 15% of the student's final grade. These papers should address several questions, including:

1. What are the main themes discussed in the readings?
2. What are the points of agreement and/or disagreement between the readings?
3. What empirical and/or theoretical problems can you observe in the readings?
4. Which readings are most persuasive, and why?
5. What do these readings offer for understanding a contemporary policy issue?

Response papers should be 1,000-1,200 words in length, submitted as a Microsoft Word document, and written in Times New Roman, 12-point font with 1-inch margins. There is no required citation format; however, students should clearly source any quotations or references that appear in the paper with consistent citation format (MLA, Chicago, APA, etc.). Papers falling outside the required word count range will automatically lose 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g., a paper that would have otherwise been an A- would become a B+).

Essays are due to the instructor via Canvas by 10:49am MT (before class begins) on the day that the topic is discussed in class. This serves to guarantee that only the student's original thoughts appear in the essay, rather than a summary of discussion in class. Once a topic has been covered in class, students may no longer write a response paper on that topic.

Students will sign up for response paper topics in week two (2) of class. This will guarantee that several students have thoroughly evaluated the material every week, which will promote a more engaged classroom discussion. This will also facilitate a regular balance of paper submissions throughout the semester, which allows for faster grading.

CRISIS SIMULATION EXERCISE (10%)

Students will participate in a group activity on October 27 in which the professor presents a crisis scenario to the class and provides time for each group to develop a response to the scenario. Students will have time to discuss policy options with their group before presenting and defending the logic of their decisions to the class. The professor will provide students with exercise-specific instructions and any prereading materials as the exercise approaches.

Grades for this exercise will consist of two equally weighted components. First, the group will receive a grade from the professor for the quality of presentation and ability to connect lessons from the course to the scenario. Each member of the group will receive the same grade for this portion. Second, group members will grade the other members in their group for their contributions to the discussion and development of policy responses. The peer evaluation component of the grade will occur after each group submits their paper for the exercise (see below).

CRISIS SIMULATION PAPER (25%)

After the crisis simulation exercise, the professor will update the crisis scenario in response to the classroom's policy suggestions. Each group will then be tasked with writing a paper that details how the group would respond to the updated scenario. The professor will provide students with more detailed instructions and expectations at the time of the crisis simulation exercise.

Students should expect the crisis simulation paper to be 1,500-2,000 words in length, submitted as a Microsoft Word document, and written in Times New Roman, 12-point font with 1-inch margins. There is no required citation format; however, students should clearly source any quotations or references that appear in the paper with consistent citation format (MLA, Chicago, APA, etc.). Papers falling outside the required word count range will automatically lose 1/3 of a letter grade (e.g., a paper that would have otherwise been an A- would become a B+). These papers are due via Canvas by 11:59pm MT on Friday, November 4.

Grades for this exercise will consist of two equally weighted components. First, the group will receive a grade from the professor for the quality and clarity of the paper in identifying coherent goals and supporting the argument for their policy prescription. Each member of the group will receive the same grade for this portion. Second, group members will grade the other members in their group for their contributions to the discussion and development of policy responses. The form for filling out this information will be made available on Canvas and will be due by 10:49am MT on Thursday, November 10.

I. FOUNDATIONS

WEEK 1 (AUGUST 25) – THE WHAT AND WHY OF SECURITY STUDIES

1. David A. Baldwin, "Security Studies and the End of the Cold War," *World Politics*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (October 1995), pp. 117-118, 126-141.
2. Richard K. Betts, "Should Strategic Studies Survive?" *World Politics*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (October 1997), pp. 7-34.
3. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 75-89.

WEEK 2 (SEPTEMBER 1) – ANARCHY AND THE SECURITY DILEMMA

1. Charles L. Glaser, "The Security Dilemma Revisited," *World Politics*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (October 1997), pp. 171-193.
2. John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York, N.Y.: W. W. Norton, 2001), pp. 1-4, 29-54.
3. Evan Braden Montgomery, "Breaking Out of the Security Dilemma: Realism, Reassurance, and the Problem of Uncertainty," *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Fall 2010), pp. 151-167, 169, 183-185.

II. BEGINNING AND ENDING WARS

WEEK 3 (SEPTEMBER 8) – RATIONALIST EXPLANATIONS FOR WAR

1. Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 615-628.
2. Robert Gilpin, "The Theory of Hegemonic War," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 591-610.
3. Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War*, 3d ed. (New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1988), pp. 108-124.
4. Dan Reiter, "Exploring the Bargaining Model of War," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (March 2003), pp. 27-33.

WEEK 4 (SEPTEMBER 15) – REGIME TYPE AND WAR

1. Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett, “Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 3 (September 1993), pp. 624-632, 636-637.
2. Sebastian Rosato, “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (November 2003), pp. 585-600.
3. James D. Fearon, “Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 3 (September 1994), pp. 577-582, 585-587.
4. Jessica L. Weeks, “Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve,” *International Organization*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Fall 2007), pp. 35-49, 59-61.

WEEK 5 (SEPTEMBER 22) – WAR TERMINATION

1. Fred Charles Iklé, *Every War Must End*, 2d ed. (New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 2005), pp. 59-105.
2. Dan Reiter, *How Wars End* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009), pp. 22-50.

III. MILITARY POWER

WEEK 6 (SEPTEMBER 29) – COERCIVE DIPLOMACY I: FOUNDATIONS

1. Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 1-18, 33-55, 69-78, 99-109, 116-125.

WEEK 7 (OCTOBER 6) – COERCIVE DIPLOMACY II: CREDIBILITY

1. Daryl G. Press, “The Credibility of Power: Assessing the ‘Appeasement’ Crises of the 1930s,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Winter 2004/05), pp. 136-169.
2. Alex Weisiger and Keren Yarhi-Milo, “Revisiting Reputation: How Past Actions Matter in International Politics,” *International Organization*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (Spring 2015), pp. 473-495.

Week 8 (October 13) – NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. Robert Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution: Statecraft and the Prospect of Armageddon* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 1-45.
2. Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press, *The Myth of the Nuclear Revolution: Power Politics in the Atomic Age* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2020), pp. 1-30.

WEEK 9 (OCTOBER 20) – MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS I: TECHNOLOGY AND FORCE EMPLOYMENT

1. Keith L. Shimko, *The Iraq Wars and America's Military Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 1-25.
2. Stephen Biddle, *Military Power: Explaining Victory and Defeat in Modern Battle* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004), pp. 28-51.

WEEK 10 (OCTOBER 27) – CRISIS SIMULATION EXERCISE

Week 11 (November 3) – NO CLASS: PROF. ARCENEUX AT CONFERENCE

WEEK 12 (NOVEMBER 10) – CRISIS SIMULATION DEBRIEF

WEEK 13 (NOVEMBER 17) – MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS II: STATE AND SOCIETY

1. Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam III, "Democracy and Battlefield Military Effectiveness," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (June 1998), pp. 259-267, 274-275.
2. Caitlin Talmadge, *The Dictator's Army: Battlefield Effectiveness in Authoritarian Regimes* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2015), pp. 12-27.
3. Jasen Castillo, *Endurance and War: The National Sources of Military Cohesion* (Stanford, C.A.: Stanford University Press, 2014), pp. 16-38.

WEEK 14 (NOVEMBER 24) – NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING BREAK

IV. ASYMMETRIC CONFLICT

WEEK 15 (DECEMBER 1) – COUNTERINSURGENCY

1. David Kilcullen, *Counterinsurgency* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 1-13.
2. Jacqueline L. Hazelton, “The ‘Hearts and Minds’ Fallacy: Violence, Coercion, and Success in Counterinsurgency Warfare,” *International Security*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Summer 2017), pp. 80-113.
3. David M. Edelstein, “Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Summer 2004), pp. 49-83.

WEEK 16 (DECEMBER 8) – CIVIL WARS

1. James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 1 (February 2003), pp. 75-90.
2. Barbara F. Walter, “Bargaining Failures and Civil War,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 12 (2009), pp. 243-259.
3. Monica Duffy Toft, “Ending Civil Wars: A Case for Rebel Victory?” *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Spring 2010), pp. 7-36.