

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.

DISABILITY-RELATED ACCOMMODATIONS

If you believe that you need accommodations for a disability, please contact the Office of Disability Services (ODS), 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.

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*, 3rd 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 21ST 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.