

# TEACHING PORTFOLIO

GILES DAVID ARCENEUX  
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

## CONTENTS

1. TEACHING STATEMENT	1
2. TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS	2
3. SYLLABUS FOR PSC 322: INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (UNDERGRADUATE)	7

## TEACHING STATEMENT

My experience as an instructor at Syracuse University has prepared me to offer courses in International Relations Theory, International Security, and U.S. Foreign Policy. Building upon my research, I would also be prepared to offer substantive courses such as Nuclear Strategy and Operations and Civil-Military Relations. Furthermore, I would be interested in teaching methods courses, including Qualitative Political Analysis and Introduction to Quantitative Methods. Although the content of these courses varies widely, my goals as an instructor remain centered on a common teaching philosophy. Specifically, I promote three learning objectives as an instructor.

First, I require students to move beyond declarative, factual knowledge to develop broader intellectual skills that enable students to conceptualize and critique theoretical debates. The development of these cognitive capacities extends beyond the subject matter of a given class and provides students with analytical skills that are valuable both inside and outside of the classroom. I promote these skills through several methods. For instance, I narrowly select readings for a given topic that clearly articulate two sides of a given debate to help students learn to frame and evaluate competing perspectives. Additionally, course assignments build upon these readings and require students to conceptually structure and critique theoretical perspectives through a variety of means, including response papers, oral presentations, and extensive classroom debate. Recent student evaluations suggest that my courses successfully advance these goals.

Second, I structure my courses to promote the development of tangible skills for students, including oral presentation and writing. Regardless of a student's career path, the ability to present ideas and arguments in written and oral form is universally valuable. I advance this objective by requiring students to evaluate competing theories with multiple response papers and classroom presentations. In addition to evaluating the substance of student papers and presentations, I also provide extensive written comments for each assignment, including suggestions on how to improve the presentation of the argument. Several students in my most recent course requested further discussion on this front during office hours, and those students demonstrated notable improvement in the persuasiveness of their argumentation and expressed increased confidence in their ability to articulate their positions over the course of the semester.

Third, I explicitly connect academic debates to contemporary policy issues. This helps overcome a widespread distrust of academic theory amongst students and provides examples of how these theories can be applied to understand international affairs. I emphasize the utility of theory early in my courses by positing a hypothetical crisis in international affairs—such as a nuclear standoff between North Korea and the United States—and solicit student suggestions on how to address the crisis. I conclude the exercise by emphasizing how, whether explicitly or implicitly, student responses are guided by theoretical expectations. Recent evaluations indicate that my courses are helpful for understanding international relations theory and connecting theory to practice.

In sum, I encourage students to develop cognitive skills that shape how they conceptualize and evaluate competing perspectives, clearly articulate their ideas through written and oral means, and connect theoretical frameworks to contemporary policy debates. Through these objectives, I strive to provide students with a skill set that is useful within the classroom and beyond.

## **TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS**

While at Syracuse University, I served as the primary course instructor for an upper-division undergraduate course on International Security. I also served as a teaching assistant for three courses, including: From Republic to Superpower – America in the World; International Actors and Issues; and Introduction to International Relations.

These courses provided valuable teaching experience along three dimensions. First, for each of these classes, I obtained experience with independent instruction. As a teaching assistant, I was responsible for developing lesson plans and independently managing discussion sections on a weekly basis. As an instructor, I was further responsible for designing the course content and assignments. Second, I directed a wide range of classroom types, including lower-level undergraduate, upper-level undergraduate, and master's-level students, ranging from fifteen to sixty students per semester. Third, in addition to delivering lectures and managing discussion, I have experience advising student research projects. As a teaching assistant for From Republic to Superpower, I oversaw the development of approximately twenty senior theses. I served in a similar role as a graduate assistant for a senior capstone course, where I advised students on the structure, methods, and content of their final projects. Combined, these courses have offered me experience in teaching and advising students across a wide range of classroom structures.

My most recent experience as the instructor of International Security suggests that my experiences have translated into more effective classroom performance. In this class, for example, my evaluations surpassed the departmental averages along all measurable dimensions. Open-ended responses further support this claim and demonstrate that students in my course improved their ability to conceptualize debates, use empirical evidence to evaluate competing arguments, and apply theoretical frameworks to understand contemporary problems in international affairs.

In future courses, I aim to improve two dimensions of my teaching. First, I plan to encourage broader participation from students. Evaluations of my early teaching suggest that a subset of students sometimes controlled classroom conversation. In my most recent course, I addressed this concern by requiring student presentations in each class, which encouraged even the most withdrawn of students to actively engage on those days. I plan to expand the use of short student presentations and more assertively seek input from apprehensive students in future classes. Second, I will make my courses more interactive by supplementing certain topics with simulations and activities. For example, to introduce theories of deterrence and coercion, I plan to simulate a modified version of the Cuban Missile Crisis to allow students to apply the competing theoretical positions and use historical evidence to estimate the plausible consequences of student decisions.

The remainder of this section presents quantitative and qualitative assessments of my effectiveness as an instructor. I present these evaluations in reverse chronological order, beginning with my most recent teaching experience. Evaluations from courses that I have taught multiple times are grouped into single reports. Whenever possible, I compare my performance to the departmental average and to my own evaluations over time. For each course, I include a small sample of qualitative, open-ended responses. Complete student evaluations for these courses are available upon request. I also include instructor assessment of my performance as a teaching assistant whenever available.

**Course:** PSC 322: International Security  
**Term(s):** Summer 2017  
**Role:** Instructor  
**Enrollment:** Undergraduate; 14 students

	<i>My Avg.</i>	<i>Dept. Avg.</i>
1. This course helped me to describe U.S. political institutions and explain how they operate	<b>4.77</b>	4.42
2. This course helped me to describe the structure and politics of the international system or countries outside the United States	<b>4.93</b>	4.45
3. This course helped me to apply political science concepts, theories, and/or philosophies to explain current political issues and policy debates	<b>5.00</b>	4.39
4. This course helped me to communicate in written and oral form about politics, and helped me to organize ideas, create and defend an argument, and use and cite sources properly	<b>4.86</b>	4.33
5. This course helped me to conduct or evaluate political research (quantitative or qualitative in nature), and evaluate the extent to which arguments are well reasoned and/or empirically supported	<b>4.93</b>	4.22
6. The objectives of the course were clear	<b>4.79</b>	4.59
7. The instructor was enthusiastic in presenting course content	<b>5.00</b>	4.59
8. When appropriate, the instructor presented divergent viewpoints	<b>4.93</b>	4.41
9. The instructor treated students with respect	<b>4.93</b>	4.63
10. Class discussions contributed to my understanding of the subject	<b>5.00</b>	4.47
11. I was comfortable asking questions in this class	<b>4.86</b>	4.22
12. The instructor was available for help outside of class	<b>4.71</b>	4.42

*Note: This table compares my average to the departmental average on a 1-5 scale, defined as: (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neither agree nor disagree; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly agree. Values where my average is above the departmental average are presented in bold font.*

**Which aspects of this course were most valuable to your overall learning experience?**

- The learning experience was heightened by [the instructor's] objectivity, he was always unbiased and respectful to all viewpoints
- There was a sense of community that began to crop up which helped contribute favorably to the discussion and made four-hour classes much more pleasant
- Very personable teacher who cares about his students and their success
- One of the most effective educators I have ever had the pleasure of knowing
- The course was very rigorous and required you to not only learn key concepts, yet also understand divergent models and alternative ways of thinking

**Which aspects of this course would you suggest changing?**

- The reading was a lot of pages but very doable when taking a regular length course
- The course is very intensive and requires a lot of time to truly understand key concepts
- Adding more time to do the assignments and more use of visuals

**Course:** IRP 400/PSC 600: From Republic to Superpower – America in the World  
**Term(s):** Spring 2016; Spring 2017  
**Role:** Teaching Assistant (Professor: James B. Steinberg)  
**Enrollment:** Graduate/undergraduate; 21 students (average; 15 undergraduate/6 graduate)

	<i>Spring 2016</i>	<i>Spring 2017</i>
1. TA was usually prepared for section	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
2. TA was on time to class	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
3. TA seemed well organized	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
4. Grading was generally fair	<b>4.00</b>	3.92
5. Assignments were returned on time	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
6. Comments on assignments were useful	<b>4.00</b>	3.92
7. TA seemed to enjoy teaching section	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
8. TA helped to clarify the reading	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
9. TA helped prepare me for exams	<b>4.00</b>	3.90
10. TA encouraged student participation	3.67	<b>4.00</b>
11. TA showed respect for students' ideas	3.89	<b>4.00</b>
12. TA was available to help students	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
13. I felt comfortable approaching the TA with my concerns	3.89	<b>3.92</b>
14. I learned a lot in this section	3.89	<b>4.00</b>

*Note: This table summarizes my quantitative evaluations on a 1-4 scale. The scale is defined as follows: (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Agree; (4) Strongly agree. The highest scores for each question are presented in bold, comparing across semesters.*

**Please list the aspects of this section and of the TA you particularly liked:**

- The TA made us feel comfortable to participate in class while challenging us at the same time
- He pushed us to think more in depth and critically
- TA is passionate about the subject, incredibly knowledgeable, and highly engaging
- David prioritized the concerns and success of his students and would make a strong effort to help in any way he could
- The sections were clearly organized and elaborated/reinforced lecture points
- David has a wide range of knowledge on subjects related to international relations and is talented in presenting what he knows
- David was definitely the best TA I've had at Syracuse
- David was always available, and gave helpful feedback on all writing assignments

**Please list the aspects of this section and of the TA you disliked most:**

- Discussions revolved around a few people
- Sometimes I felt he was intimidating, but as the semester goes on, the feeling went away
- Many classmates were not encouraged to participate

**Please list suggestions for how the TA could improve his/her sections and teaching:**

- The TA should encourage students who do not participate well

**Course:** PAI 710: International Actors and Issues  
**Term(s):** Fall 2016  
**Role:** Teaching Assistant (Professor: James B. Steinberg)  
**Enrollment:** Graduate; 29 students

---

	<i>Fall 2016</i>
1. TA was usually prepared for section	4.00
2. TA was on time to class	4.00
3. TA seemed well organized	4.00
4. Grading was generally fair	3.58
5. Assignments were returned on time	3.70
6. Comments on assignments were useful	3.74
7. TA seemed to enjoy teaching section	4.00
8. TA helped to clarify the reading	3.96
9. TA helped prepare me for exams	3.92
10. TA encouraged student participation	3.93
11. TA showed respect for students' ideas	3.89
12. TA was available to help students	3.96
13. I felt comfortable approaching the TA with my concerns	3.93
14. I learned a lot in this section	3.70

---

*Note: This table summarizes my quantitative evaluations on a 1-4 scale. The scale is defined as follows: (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Agree; (4) Strongly agree.*

---

**Please list the aspects of this section and of the TA you particularly liked:**

- His teaching style is engaging, and you can tell he wants his students to succeed
- Open atmosphere, ideas and discussion were encouraged
- Was always available for students and provided helpful additional insight during office hours
- The constructive criticism was very helpful, he never let a badly-constructed argument pass
- I learned more with David than I learned from any other professor this year
- David has an obvious level of mastery with the material
- Able to demonstrate the applicability of the readings to today's foreign affairs

**Please list the aspects of this section and of the TA you disliked most:**

- Maybe start at the very basic foundation for some concepts and don't assume everyone is at the same level
- A more focused reading list would make discussion better and it would encourage more people to read
- Biggest complaint is that assignments weren't turned back in a timely fashion

**Please list suggestions for how the TA could improve his/her sections and teaching:**

- Relate the readings/lectures more to the papers
- Clearer guidelines on the papers; seemed to be large disconnect with [the professor]
- Engaging the 2-3 "silent" members of the section would improve perspectives and discussion

**Course:** PSC 124: Introduction to International Relations  
**Term(s):** Fall 2013; Spring 2014; Fall 2015  
**Role:** Teaching Assistant (Professor: Terrell Northrup)  
**Enrollment:** Undergraduate; 48 students (average)

	<i>Fall 2013</i>	<i>Spring 2014</i>	<i>Fall 2015</i>
1. TA was usually prepared for section	3.97	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
2. TA was on time to class	3.97	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
3. TA seemed well organized	3.94	3.98	<b>4.00</b>
4. Grading was generally fair	3.94	3.84	<b>4.00</b>
5. Assignments were returned on time	3.88	<b>3.91</b>	3.84
6. Comments on assignments were useful	3.88	<b>3.90</b>	3.89
7. TA seemed to enjoy teaching section	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
8. TA helped to clarify the reading	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	3.95
9. TA helped prepare me for exams	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
10. TA encouraged student participation	3.94	<b>3.95</b>	3.89
11. TA showed respect for students' ideas	<b>4.00</b>	3.91	<b>4.00</b>
12. TA was available to help students	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>
13. I felt comfortable approaching the TA with my concerns	<b>3.94</b>	3.91	3.92
14. I learned a lot in this section	3.94	<b>3.98</b>	3.95

*Note: This table summarizes my quantitative evaluations on a 1-4 scale. The scale is defined as follows: (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Agree; (4) Strongly agree. The highest scores for each question are presented in bold, comparing across semesters.*

**Please list the aspects of this section and of the TA you particularly liked:**

- Urged us to think critically about every concept
- He didn't make you uncomfortable if you didn't know the material
- He genuinely cared about his students succeeding
- Very interactive which made learning more interesting
- David is always super prepared for class and is a great facilitator of discussion
- David wanted to make sure we truly understood everything, and didn't just try to memorize it
- He was extremely organized, encouraging, and coherent

**Please list the aspects of this section and of the TA you disliked most:**

- Lack of time for some discussion due to projects
- Not always getting a review before the quizzes
- Harsh questions about the group project

**Please list suggestions for how the TA could improve his/her sections and teaching:**

- Sometimes he got very involved in one topic that we didn't particularly need to know about
- A lot of people don't like to talk, but it'd be cool if he got more people to actively participate
- Get more students involved in discussion by reaching out to the back row more often

**INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**  
**PSC 322 – Summer 2017**  
**Syracuse University**

**Instructor Information:** David Arceneaux  
gdarcene@syr.edu  
025 Eggers Hall  
Office Hours: By appointment

**Course Information:** Monday – Friday, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM  
Crouse Hinds 101

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course serves as an introduction to the field of security studies within the discipline of political science. In this class, we will examine the causes, conduct, and consequences of conflict in the international system. The first half of the course addresses the foundations of security studies and general frameworks for understanding war and peace in the international system. The second half of the course covers specific topics in international security. The course aims to provide students with a policy-relevant understanding of the academic literature and requires students to examine how academic debates apply to contemporary security issues.

Because this course is condensed into a span of two weeks, the daily workload is highly rigorous. Each class is divided into two halves, with each half representing the equivalent of one regular-semester session. In addition to four hours per day in class, students should expect to spend two to three hours per night reading and preparing for class the following day. Because of this time commitment, students should not be taking other courses simultaneously, and it is strongly discouraged for students to assume extra responsibilities such as work during these two weeks.

**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
- Communicate in written and oral form about politics in a way that demonstrates the ability to organize ideas, create and defend an argument, and use and cite sources properly
- Evaluate political research and evaluate the extent to which arguments are well-reasoned and/or empirically supported

## **COURSE AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES**

### **GRADING POLICY**

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

### **LATE ASSIGNMENT POLICY**

Assignments that are turned in 1 minute to 12 hours late after their due date will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade. Assignments turned in 12 to 24 hours after the due date will be penalized by a full letter grade. Assignments will not be accepted more than 24 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.

The instructor will confirm receipt of all assignments submitted electronically. If a student has not received confirmation of receipt from the instructor within 12 hours of submitting an assignment, that student should e-mail the instructor to verify that the assignment was successfully delivered.

### **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 participation.

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 participation.

For those who are interested, recent research has demonstrated that taking notes by hand significantly improves the long-term retention and understanding of concepts. For summaries of such analyses, see:

<http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Benefits-of-No-Tech-Note/228089/>

<http://www.vox.com/2014/6/4/5776804/note-taking-by-hand-versus-laptop>

### **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

Syracuse University's Academic Integrity Policy holds students accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. 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. The university policy governs appropriate citation and use of sources, the integrity of work submitted in exams and assignments, and the veracity of signatures on attendance sheets and other verification of participation in class activities. The policy also prohibits students from submitting the same written work in more than one class without receiving written authorization in advance from both instructors. 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 Academic Integrity Policy. The standard sanction for a first offense by a graduate student is suspension or expulsion. For more information and the complete policy, see [academicintegrity.syr.edu](http://academicintegrity.syr.edu).

#### DISABILITY-RELATED ACCOMMODATIONS

If you believe that you need accommodations for a disability, please contact the Office of Disability Services (ODS), [disabilityservices.syr.edu](http://disabilityservices.syr.edu), located in Room 309 of 804 University Avenue, or call (315) 443-4498, TDD: (315) 443-1371 for an appointment to discuss your needs and the process for requesting accommodations. ODS is responsible for coordinating disability-related accommodations and will issue students with documented Disabilities Accommodation Authorization Letters, as appropriate. Since accommodations may require early planning and generally are not provided retroactively, please contact ODS as soon as possible.

#### RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE POLICY

The Syracuse University Religious Observances Policy recognizes the diversity of faiths represented among the campus community and protects the rights of students, faculty, and staff to observe religious holidays according to their tradition. Under the policy, students are provided an opportunity to make up any examination, study, or work requirements that may be missed due to a religious observance provided they notify their instructors before the end of the second week of classes for regular session classes and by the submission deadline for flexibly formatted classes. For more information on this policy, please see [supolicies.syr.edu](http://supolicies.syr.edu).

## **COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION**

Grades are comprised of four components:

Participation	30%
Discussion leader	10%
Reading questions	10%
Response papers	50% (2 papers; 25% each)

### **PARTICIPATION (30%)**

As an upper-division 300-level 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. All readings are available in PDF form on Blackboard. Students will be graded daily 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

### **READING QUESTIONS (10%)**

Before each class, students are required to submit two reading questions to the instructor. 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 e-mail to the instructor by 10:00 AM EST 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 deadline but before the beginning of class are subject to the late assignment policy. 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

### **DISCUSSION LEADER (10%)**

Students are required to lead discussion for half of one class. Students will prepare an 8-10 minute presentation at the beginning of class. These presentations should not simply summarize the week's readings. Instead, students should introduce the topics by identifying core concepts and debates and providing a framework for thinking about and evaluating the readings. Students should also identify the weaknesses, limitations, and

debates present in the readings. The presentation should provide a baseline for discussion and debate during class. PowerPoint is optional.

#### RESPONSE PAPERS (50%)

Each student will write two short written assignments during the course. Each essay is worth 25% 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?

Response papers should be 1,000-1,200 words in length, produced in Microsoft Word, 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.).

Students may write on any two topics of their choosing. Essays are due to the instructor via e-mail by 12:59 PM EST (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.

## **COURSE SCHEDULE**

### **CLASS 1 (5/15) – FOUNDATIONS**

#### **PART I: THE WHAT AND WHY OF SECURITY STUDIES**

- David A. Baldwin, “The Concept of Security,” *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23 (1997), pp. 5-6, 12-18.
- Roland Paris, “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?” *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Fall 2001), pp. 96-100.
- Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 75-89.

#### *Recommended Reading*

- Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, *Causes of War* (West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 14-15.
- Jack Snyder, “One World, Rival Theories,” *Foreign Policy*, No. 145 (November/December 2004), pp. 53-62.

#### **PART II: ANARCHY AND THE SECURITY DILEMMA**

- Robert Jervis, “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma,” *World Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (January 1978), pp. 167-170, 186-214.

### **CLASS 2 (5/16) – BALANCING AND POLARITY**

#### **PART I: BALANCING AND BANDWAGONING**

- Ernst B. Haas, “The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept, or Propaganda?” in *Realism Reader*, ed. Colin Elman and Michael A. Jensen (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2014), pp. 76-80.
- Stephen M. Walt, “Alliance Formation and the Balance of Power,” *International Security*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Spring 1985), pp. 7-13.
- Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, “Balancing on Land and at Sea: Do States Ally against the Leading Global Power?” *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Summer 2010), pp. 7-19, 36-39.

#### **PART II: UNIPOLARITY**

- William Wohlforth, “The Stability of a Unipolar World,” in *Realism Reader*, ed. Colin Elman and Michael A. Jensen (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2014), pp. 383-391.
- Martha Finnemore, “Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn’t All It’s Cracked Up to Be,” *World Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (January 2009), pp. 58-76.

### **CLASS 3 (5/17) – CAUSES OF WAR**

#### **PART I: STRUCTURAL EXPLANATIONS FOR WAR**

- Kenneth N. Waltz, “The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 615-624.
- Robert Gilpin, “The Theory of Hegemonic War,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 591-610.

#### *Recommended Reading*

- Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, *Causes of War* (West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 38-48.

#### **PART II: THE BARGAINING MODEL OF WAR**

- Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1988), pp. 108-124.
- Dan Reiter, “Exploring the Bargaining Model of War,” *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (March 2003), pp. 27-33.

#### *Recommended Reading*

- Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, *Causes of War* (West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 63-69.

### **CLASS 4 (5/18) – DOMESTIC POLITICS, WAR, AND PEACE**

#### **PART I: DEMOCRATIC PEACE THEORY**

- Colin Elman, “Introduction: History, Theory, and the Democratic Peace,” *International History Review*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (December 2001), pp. 757-761.
- Sebastian Rosato, “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (November 2003), pp. 585-600.
- Michael W. Doyle, “Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 3 (August 2005), pp. 463-466.

#### *Recommended Reading*

- Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, *Causes of War* (West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 104-115.

#### **PART II: AUDIENCE COSTS**

- 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.
- Jessica L. Weeks, “Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve,” *International Organization*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Fall 2007), pp. 35-49, 59-61.

- Jack Snyder and Erica D. Borghard, “The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 105, No. 3 (August 2011), pp. 437-442.

## **CLASS 5 (5/19) – COERCION AND COOPERATION**

### PART I: DETERRENCE AND COERCION

- Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 1966), pp. 2-6, 69-78, 99-105, 116-125.
- Daryl G. Press, “The Credibility of Power: Assessing the ‘Appeasement’ Crises of the 1930s,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Winter 2004/05), pp. 136-142.

### PART II: REASSURANCE, ENGAGEMENT, AND APPEASEMENT

- Janice Gross Stein, “Reassurance in International Conflict Management,” *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 106, No. 3 (Autumn 1991), pp. 431-451.

## **CLASS 6 (5/22) – NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND STRATEGY**

### PART I: NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

- Scott D. Sagan, “Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb,” *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Winter 1996/97), pp. 54-59, 63-65, 73-76, 85-86.
- Christopher Way and Jessica L.P. Weeks, “Making it Personal: Regime Type and Nuclear Proliferation,” *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 58, No. 3 (July 2014), pp. 705-710, 716-717.

### PART II: NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE MODERN ERA

- Vipin Narang, “Posturing for Peace?” *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Winter 2009/10), pp. 38-50, 55-56, 76-78.
- Nina Tannenwald, “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use,” *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (Summer 1999), pp. 433-442, 462-465.

## **CLASS 7 (5/23) – MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS**

### PART I: REGIME TYPE AND BATTLEFIELD EFFECTIVENESS

- 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.
- Stephen Biddle and Stephen Long, “Democracy and Military Effectiveness: A Deeper Look,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (August 2004), pp. 525-533, 541-543.
- Caitlin Talmadge, *The Dictator’s Army: Battlefield Effectiveness in Authoritarian Regimes* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2015), pp. 12-27.

## PART II: THE MODERN SYSTEM OF WARFARE

- Stephen Biddle, *Military Power: Explaining Victory and Defeat in Modern Battle* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004), pp. 28-51.

## CLASS 8 (5/24) – ASYMMETRIC CONFLICT

### PART I: INSURGENCY AND COUNTERINSURGENCY

- David Kilcullen, *Counterinsurgency* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 1-13.
- David Kilcullen, *The Accidental Guerrilla: Fighting Small Wars in the Midst of a Big One* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 34-38.
- Sarah Sewall, “A Radical Field Manual,” in Department of the Army, *FM 3-24: Counterinsurgency Field Manual* (Chicago, I.L.: University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. xl-xliii.
- Gian P. Gentile, “A Strategy of Tactics: Population-Centric COIN and the Army,” *Parameters*, Vol. 39 (Autumn 2009), pp. 5-16.

### PART II: MILITARY OCCUPATION

- David M. Edelstein, “Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Summer 2004), pp. 49-52, 58-83.

## CLASS 9 (5/25) – CIVIL WARS

### PART I: ORIGINS

- James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 1 (February 2003), pp. 75-82, 88-89.
- Paul Collier, Anke Hoeffler, and Dominic Rohner, “Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War,” *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (January 2009), pp. 1-5, 24.
- Elaine K. Denny and Barbara F. Walter, “Ethnicity and Civil War,” *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2014), pp. 199-207.

### *Recommended Reading*

- Barbara F. Walter, “Bargaining Failures and Civil War,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 12 (2009), pp. 244-252.

### PART II: TERMINATION

- Roy Licklider, “The Consequences of Negotiated Settlements in Civil Wars, 1945-1993,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 89, No. 3 (September 1995), pp. 681-687.
- Barbara F. Walter, “The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement,” *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Summer 1997), pp. 335-343, 360-363.

- Monica Duffy Toft, “Ending Civil Wars: A Case for Rebel Victory?” *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Spring 2010), pp. 7-11, 27-36.

*Recommended Reading*

- Barbara F. Walter, “Bargaining Failures and Civil War,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 12 (2009), pp. 252-259.

**CLASS 10 (5/26) – CHALLENGES AND DEBATES**

PART I: CONTEMPORARY USES OF FORCE

- Robert Jervis, “Force in Our Times,” *International Relations*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (December 2011), pp. 403-420.
- Tanisha M. Fazal, “Why States No Longer Declare War,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (November 2012), pp. 557-571, 591-592.

PART II: US GRAND STRATEGY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

- Barry R. Posen, “Pull Back: The Case for a Less Activist Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92, No. 1 (January/February 2013), pp. 116-128.
- Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, “Lean Forward: In Defense of American Engagement,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92, No. 1 (January/February 2013), pp. 130-142.