

# SS307: International Relations

## Fall 2017 (AY18-1)

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY  
COURSE HOURS: A, B, C, G, H, L

Course Director: Dr. Robert Person

Instructors: MAJ Nerea Cal, MAJ Brandon Colas, MAJ Alex Deep, CPT(P) Sarah Gerstein, Lt Col Patrick Kriz, LTC Brandon Parrish, CPT(P) Kerney Perlik, Mr. Russell Singer, CPT(P) Brian Vaeni, CPT Zach Watson, MAJ Andrew Webb, MAJ Blair Wilcox

## Course Overview

**IMPORTANT NOTICE TO CADETS:** The SS307 syllabus has been rewritten from top to bottom for the 2017-18 academic year. It includes new lessons, new readings, and new course textbooks. Relying on old course notes, study guides, and shared files is an invitation to poor performance, as you will be studying the wrong materials. Should you choose to ignore this advice and use such resources this semester, you are still required to document them like any other source used or assistance received – failure to do so is a violation of the plagiarism and misrepresentation policy detailed below and in the DAW (July 2017 version).

**Course Description:** “*Why do states do what they do? What causes conflict and cooperation in the international system?*” These are the overarching questions that we will engage in SS307 as we seek to use theories of international relations to explain state behavior. The course largely employs a case-based approach to study state behavior by analyzing key events and phenomena in international relations with international relations theory and political science methodology. In doing so, we will seek to understand the general causes of war, peace, competition, conflict, and cooperation in the military, political, economic, and social relations between states through a series of illuminated cases.

The course is built upon a foundational philosophy of intellectual pluralism. Such an approach emphasizes the importance of analyzing international relations from multiple angles and through multiple theoretical lenses in order to explain *why* things happen, not just describe *what* happens. In this spirit, Part I of the course (*Foundations of International Relations Theory*) presents the main schools of thought (or “traditions”) in IR theory — realism, liberalism, and constructivism – along with a discussion of the social scientific method that serves as the backbone of the discipline regardless of theoretical approach. Part II (*Theories of Foreign Policy*) provides both complement and contrast with the IR theory presented in Part I as attention shifts to domestic-level explanations for state behavior and the foreign policy actions that result.

With a firm grounding in IR theory, we turn our attention to the application of theory to explain significant empirical cases in the history of international relations. In Part III (*Historical Cases in International Relations*) our objectives are threefold: 1) learn additional theories of IR beyond those introduced in Part I; 2) Use those theories to explain the causes and consequences of the *specific* cases that are the focus of lessons; and 3) leverage this synthesis of theory and case evidence to draw broader lessons about the causes of general phenomena in IR.

This approach is carried into Part IV (*Contemporary Challenges in International Relations*) as we utilize theory to understand and explain contemporary cases and the challenges they pose to states in the international system. Through exploration of diverse phenomena like nuclear proliferation, state failure, terrorism,

civil conflict, globalization, and financial warfare, we will come to appreciate the myriad of ways in which the forces international politics are — or are not— changing in the 21st century. Here we come up against the existential question of international relations: are the principles of international politics timeless, unchanged since Sparta challenged the rise of Athens? Or does the “why?” of our driving question continue to evolve in an ever-changing world?

## Course Objectives

Upon completion of SS307, each cadet will be able to do the following:

1. Think critically about international affairs by studying competing theoretical perspectives, questioning assumptions, and assessing evidence in order to develop a deeper understanding of puzzles of international relations and an appreciation of the value of intellectual pluralism.
2. Read critically a wide spectrum of academic, popular, and policy-oriented literature in international relations to understand key arguments and debates in the field and apply standards of social scientific analysis to critique the logic, argumentation, and evidence in IR literature.
3. Describe, analyze, and explain key historical events in international affairs using theories of international relations and political science, in combination with empirical evidence drawn from primary and secondary sources.
4. Use theories of international relations and political science to analyze and explain current events in international affairs; understand the major issues and actors in global politics; and assess policy implications of contemporary challenges in the international system.
5. Critically evaluate the normative and ethical implications of international relations theories, foreign policy, and state behavior.
6. Communicate clear and effective analysis and arguments about complex international issues verbally and in writing.

## Key Dates

- SOSH Paper Proposal due: Monday, 18 September, 1600
- Writ: Lesson 12 (21/22 September), in class
- WPR: Friday, 13 October, Dean’s Hour
- SOSH Paper outline: Friday, 20 October, 1600
- SOSH Paper peer draft due: Tuesday, 31 October, 1600
- Guest lecture by Professor Graham Allison (mandatory): Thursday, 2 November, Dean’s Hour
- Peer review comments due to partners: Thursday, 2 November, 1600
- SOSH Paper due: Thursday, 9 November, 1600
- TEE Week: 16-22 December
- Guest lecture by Ambassador Thomas Pickering (mandatory): TBD

# Requirements

## Graded Assignments

The course requirements, worth 1,000 points in total, are as follows:

1. **Assigned Readings, Lessons 1-40:** The key to success in SS307 is completing the assigned readings before each lesson. Though there are no points assigned directly to readings, they are the daily “homework” for the class, just like a problem set in math. Failure to do the readings might not have an immediate grade impact comparable to failure to submit a problem set, but the long-term consequences are significant: success or failure on ALL of the course graded events below hinges on your comprehension and utilization of the ideas presented in readings.
2. **SOSH Paper Proposal (25 points, Monday, 18 September, 1600):** The Research and Analysis Paper (commonly known as the “SOSH Paper” is a multi-step project that begins with a one-page paper proposal. Cadets will select their own case to study that is relevant to the discipline of international relations. Cases must be “recent,” defined as taking place since the end of the Cold War in 1991; however, cadets are not permitted to write on cases that are already covered in depth in the SS307 syllabus. Relevant cases may include instances of war onset, war termination, non-militarized conflict, international treaties or agreements, alliance formation or dissolution, trade or other economic agreements, international organization formation, institutional creation, and many others. The objective of the SOSH Paper assignment is to use IR theory to explain the cause(s) of your case through rigorous analysis.
3. **Writ (25 points, Lesson 12 (21/22 September), in class):** The in-class writ will test each cadet’s critical reading skills, covering all assigned readings from Part I of the course.
4. **Written Partial Review (150 points, Friday, 13 October, Dean’s Hour):** Cadets will take a cumulative WPR during Dean’s Hour midway through the semester. The exam will test cadets’ critical reading and analysis skills, focusing on key concepts from the course material presented in the first half of the course. A make-up exam will be offered only to those cadets with a validated excuse, IAW USCC SOP (Chapter 8, card 806, section 3.a.1)<sup>1</sup> and DPOM 02-3 (section 6, para. B).<sup>2</sup>
5. **SOSH Paper Outline (50 points, Friday, 20 October, 1600):** Good organization is key to writing a successful research paper. In order to facilitate this outcome, cadets will be required to produce a formal outline of their paper, including a complete list of references to be used in the paper. Grades will be awarded based on the quality of the outline, the level of detail included in the outline, and the degree to which it conforms to the standards of a formal outline.
6. **Peer Review Draft (50 points, Tuesday, 31 October, 1600):** Cadets will produce a draft of their paper for out-of-class review by their peers. Grades will be awarded based on the quality and completeness of the draft, as well as the quality of the feedback given to partners. Your instructor will publish specific requirements and expectations for this assignment. Feedback due Thursday, 2 November, 1600.
7. **Research and Analysis Paper (“SOSH Paper”) (250 Points, Thursday, 9 November, 1600):** Cadets will write a research paper (not to exceed 4,000 words in length) that uses theories of international relations to explain the causes of an event or phenomenon of relevance to the study of IR. This assignment will develop cadets’ critical reading, conceptual thinking, critical analysis, and analytical

---

1. “Cadets are officially excused from attendance at regularly scheduled WPRs only for the following reasons: (a) Medically excused by surgeon, USMA...(b) On emergency leave or special pass. (c) Participating in corps squad competition or trips. (d) Participating in cadet public relations council trips. (e) Participating in honor investigative hearings. (f) Appearing before an investigating officer UP Regulations, USMA, or UCMJ proceedings.”

2. “WPRs may be scheduled in the Dean’s Hour, as may laboratory exercises and lectures. Scheduled classes and laboratories take priority over Dean’s Hour WPRs. Other lectures and activities should yield in priority to classes, laboratories, and Dean’s Hour WPRs.”

writing skills.<sup>3</sup>

8. **Term End Exam (250 Points, date TBD):** The Term End Exam (TEE) is a comprehensive closed-book test that covers material from the entire course. The exam evaluates cadet comprehension of key concepts in international relations and the ability of cadets to provide theoretically based critical analysis of international affairs.
9. **Instructor Assignments (100 Points):** Instructors will use discretionary points to develop additional graded assignments to support cadets' intellectual development. Your instructor will provide additional guidance on expectations for these assignments.
10. **Class Participation (100 Points):** As a seminar-style class, active cadet engagement is vital to creating the proper learning environment in SS307. Instructors will award 100 participation points through assignments and methodologies of their choosing. Active participation based on careful preparation (completing assigned reading before class) can significantly help your grade, while non-participation can significantly lower your grade. Instructors will consider quality, not just quantity, of participation.

## Grading Scale

The following grade scale will be used to assess cadet work:

Table 1: SS307 Grade Scale

	Grade	Percent	QP	Subjective Interpretation
Mastery	A+	97.0-100.0	4.33	Above standards of writing
	A	93.0-96.9	4.00	Mastery of concepts
	A-	90.0-92.9	3.67	Can apply concepts to new situations
Proficiency	B+	87.0-89.9	3.33	Meets standards of writing
	B	83.0-86.9	3.00	Solid understanding of concepts
	B-	80.0-82.9	2.67	Strong foundation for future work
Passing	C+	77.0-79.9	2.33	Approaching standards of writing
	C	73.0-76.9	2.00	Acceptable foundation for future work Acceptable understanding of concepts
Below Standard	C-	70.0-72.9	1.67	Below standards of writing
	D	67.0-69.9	1.00	Doubtful understanding of concepts Weak foundation for future work
Failing	F	Below 67.0	0.00	Unacceptable standards of writing Definitely failed to demonstrate understanding of concepts

3. This class serves as a "Writing-in-the-Core" (WiC) course in the West Point Writing Program (WPWP), which supports your development as a writer and communicator across the curriculum. As a WiC course, this class engages you in the study and practice of writing in a specific discipline. Along the way, you'll receive selective writing instruction that prepares you to complete a Signature Writing Event (SWE), which your instructor will assess for evidence of your proficiency as a writer. This assessment is separate from the grade you'll receive on the assignment. Your instructor will also foster your growth as a writer by providing you with timely, detailed, and personalized feedback. More information about the Writing Program, its underlying principles, and specific requirements (including the SWE) is available at [usma.edu/wpwp](http://usma.edu/wpwp).

The Mounger Writing Center (MWC) is a subcomponent of the Writing Program and a valuable resource for you to consider. Located on the second floor of Jefferson Hall, the MWC offers one-on-one consultations and group workshops to all Cadets, during the day as well as ESP, for any course (not just WPWP courses). All sessions are led by Graduate or Cadet Writing Fellows ready to meet you wherever you are in the writing process and work with you on virtually any kind of writing—papers, research essays, lab and technical reports, design projects, PowerPoints, even oral presentations. Conversations at the MWC are designed to help all writers express themselves more clearly, forcefully, and effectively. Appointments strongly preferred. Learn more at [usma.edu/wpwp](http://usma.edu/wpwp) (click on "Writing Center"); schedule at [usma.mywconline.com](http://usma.mywconline.com). All sessions with the MWC must be cited in your final work according to official guidance in the DAW.

## Course Readings

SS307 has undergone a major revision for AY18 and uses a new course text bundle to reflect these changes. This bundle, custom published by SAGE Press, is entitled “CUSTOM BUNDLE: US Military Academy: Foundations of International Relations.” The required bundle includes the course’s primary text, *Foundations of International Relations* (Robert Person, editor) and the secondary text, *International Politics: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Scott Handler, editor).

ALL cadets enrolled in SS307 in AY18 are required to purchase the new text bundle. Because this bundle has been custom printed for USMA, it can only be purchased through the USMA online bookstore (<http://www.usmabookstore.com>) - it is not available from other retailers like Amazon. Similarly, because the bundle is a NEW text (reflecting major changes to the SS307 syllabus this year), you will not be able to procure used copies from cadets who have taken the course previously, as their books are no longer the “approved solution.”

Instructors will conduct book checks during the first week of classes. Failure to purchase the course texts by that time may result in academic or disciplinary penalties.

A small number of required readings do not appear in either text and will be made available to cadets electronically. See syllabus for details.

## Course Policies

**Absences** You must notify your instructor and the section marcher of any planned absence at least 24 hours in advance. All graded assignments are due at their specified time: guard duty, trip sections, athletic competitions, etc. do not preclude you from turning in graded assignments on time.

**Documentation of Sources** All sources used to produce coursework in SS307 must be properly acknowledged and documented, IAW the Dean’s Documentation of Academic Work. This includes but is not limited to published and unpublished sources, written, verbal, audiovisual, and electronic sources, class notes and study guides written by someone other than you, and all assistance received from other persons. All ideas of any kind (not just direct quotes) must be thoroughly documented through footnotes and a works cited page. **If you have any questions or doubts as to whether or how to document a source or idea, ASK YOUR INSTRUCTOR FOR GUIDANCE in order avoid a possible honor violation.**

**Citation Style** All sources used in your written work must be documented using the Chicago Manual of Style’s “notes and bibliography” style (16th edition). This citation style requires the use of footnotes throughout the paper, as well as a “Works Cited” list at the end. The definitive guide for how to properly format citations can be found online here: <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/16/ch14/ch14.toc.html>. You should also consult the relevant sections of the *Little, Brown Handbook* for further guidance on documentation. Failure to cite and format properly according to the Chicago notes-bibliography style may result in a reduced grade.

**Acceptable Sources** The following types of sources are considered acceptable for scholarly research and writing:

- Books: Scholarly books published by a university press or reputable trade press are good sources for your work. However, Google Books and other online book catalogs are not acceptable for use since they do not provide the entire book and may give only partial context of the author’s argument, logic, or evidence. You should always acquire and cite from the physical book from the library.

- **Academic Journal Articles:** These articles should primarily come from political science, public policy, or other academic discipline journals to be most relevant. Do not just select the first article with the name of your theory or topic that comes up in a Google, Google Scholar, or JSTOR search; some articles are more relevant and/or authoritative than others. Good places to start your search for resources (books, journal articles, primary sources, and news or magazine articles) are the citations in readings from the course.
- **Think tank papers:** Major think tanks, such as the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), Brookings Institution, the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), The RAND Corporation, the Congressional Research Service (CRS), etc. publish scholarly, topical articles or reports on contemporary international relations challenges. You should be aware of potential political biases or agendas that may color the perspective of some think tanks.
- **Primary sources:** Examples include government documents and other archival materials, memoirs, interviews, etc.
- **News or magazine articles:** You should use major national papers, such as the New York Times, Washington Post, and Wall Street Journal, and major magazines, such as The Economist, Foreign Affairs, and Foreign Policy.

**Unacceptable sources** for written work in SS307 include the following: Wikipedia or similar online encyclopedias, blogs, textbooks or lecture notes from other courses, notes or written work from other students, general encyclopedias, and web content not from any of the acceptable sources described above.

**Common Knowledge** Cadets are not required to cite in-class discussions, lectures, or instructor AI. IAW USMA DAW, this is considered “common knowledge.” However, keep in mind that most of the ideas raised in SS307 lessons come directly from course readings. You are expected to cite the relevant readings in your work rather than simply write papers based on your class notes. Information and ideas gained from course texts and assigned readings are *never* considered common knowledge and *must* be documented properly. When in doubt, ask your instructor for clarification.

**Research Resources** The librarians at the USMA library are an available resource to help you find sources for your research. You should see them as early as possible so they can help you gather materials. If you wait until the last minute, you will not obtain the resources that you need for your assignments. You can request books that are not in USMA’s collection through the InterLibrary Loan (ILIAD) system and NY Connect. The Reserve Room will have some materials related to the course.

**Paper Formatting** All typed, graded requirements must contain a title page formatted in accordance with the Dean’s Documentation of Academic Work. Use your x-number on the title page instead of your name to allow for blind grading. Type the essay in 12-point Times New Roman font with 1” margins all around and double-spaced lines. The top right header should include your x-number and page number.

**Late Assignments** The penalty for late submissions is 10 percentage points per 24-hour period after the due date. Cadets are required to notify instructors that they will be submitting work late. As a matter of policy, extensions will not be granted without a verified medical profile or emergency pass that justify late submission - trip sections, guard duty, athletic competitions, or other taskings do not warrant extensions. Any extensions are granted at the discretion of the Course Director. You must complete all graded assignments, late or not, to receive credit for this course.

**Regrading of Major Assignments** Cadets may request a regrade on any assignment worth 20% or more of the overall course grade. Cadets requesting a regrade will first meet with their instructor to discuss the basis for their disagreement with the original grade. If a cadet still believes that a regrade is warranted, he or she must submit a memo to the Course Director requesting a regrade within 5 business days of having

received the graded assignment. The memo should contain a detailed and specific explanation of why the cadet believes a regrade is justified. The course director will then assign two disinterested SS307 instructors to regrade the assignment. The final grade will be an average of the original instructor's grade and those of the two re graders. Thus, the final of the regrade process may be higher, lower, or consistent with the original instructor's grade. Penalties for late submission or plagiarism/misrepresentation are not subject to revision through the regrade process.

**Failed Major Assignments** Cadets who fail the SOSH Paper and the TEE on academic merit will receive automatic re-grades using the double-regrading procedures described above; a memo requesting a regrade is not necessary for such cases. Cadets will receive an average of the original grade and the two re-graded scores. Papers that fail due to late submission are not subject to automatic regrading. Failure of the SOSH Paper or TEE, regardless of a cadet's final grade in the course, may be grounds for course failure; the Head of the Department of Social Sciences will determine course passage or failure for cadets who fail the paper or TEE on a case-by-case basis.

**Multiple Submission of Academic Work** Cadets are prohibited from submitting for credit their own academic work (whether in part or in whole) that has already been submitted for credit in another course. This includes work produced for another class in a previous semester or in the current semester, as well as work produced for SS307 in a previous semester. Not only does such "double-dipping" give an unfair advantage over students who compose new work from scratch, it "short circuits" the developmental learning process of a multi-stage research process. However, cadets are allowed to build upon their "development" assignments produced in the current semester en route to the final SOSH Paper submission, including the paper proposal, outline, and peer review draft.

**SafeAssign Plagiarism Software** All cadet papers and exams will be submitted electronically via BlackBoard and analyzed using the SafeAssign plagiarism software. This tool compares submitted files against a database of all papers uploaded to BlackBoard at USMA and other colleges, as well as against online publications, databases, websites, and reference sites (like Wikipedia, etc.). Cadets are encouraged to use SafeAssign as a tool to double-check their work and ensure that everything has been properly documented. BlackBoard assignments will allow for unlimited SafeAssign submissions until the assignment is due to allow for revisions if corrections are needed.

**Plagiarism and Misrepresentation** The following outlines academic consequences of plagiarism and misrepresentation for SS307. The policies derive from the Dean's Documentation of Academic Work (DAW) and Department of Social Sciences policies. In cases where plagiarism or other academic misconduct is suspected, instructors will follow appropriate Cadet Honor System procedures. In a process distinct from referral to the Cadet Honor Committee, instructors assess the academic merit of cadet's work. Plagiarism and intentional misrepresentation are serious violations of academic integrity and demonstrate "a significant failure of scholarship by depriving your instructor, fellow cadets, and other scholars of the ability to distinguish your work from the work of others."<sup>4</sup> Therefore, any instance of plagiarism will result in an automatic failure of the assignment. When determining a numeric grade (0-66%) for the failed assignment, instructors will assess the extent and severity of plagiarism. In accordance with the SS307 regrading policy outlined in the course syllabus, all failing papers will receive an independent re-grade by two additional instructors.

The examples used below are intended to clarify common documentation errors in SS307. However, these examples are not all-inclusive and cadets should continue to use good judgment in conjunction with DAW and *The Little, Brown Handbook* as the primary guides for documentation of academic work. Omission of a specific example in the list below does not mean that it is an acceptable practice that meets the standards of academic integrity. When in doubt, seek guidance from your instructor.

---

4. Office of the Dean, Documentation of Academic Work (June 2017), United States Military Academy, 13

Plagiarism is defined as “the act of presenting someone else’s words, ideas, or work – whether accidentally or deliberately – as your own work.”<sup>5</sup> Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Presenting another’s writing or ideas as your own.
- Copying words from a source without identifying those words with quotation marks and citing in footnotes. SS307 course texts are not considered common knowledge; therefore, all course materials must be documented.
- Rewriting, paraphrasing, or summarizing a source without providing a citation to the ideas you’ve used from that source. The most common example of this type of plagiarism in SS307 is failure to cite and attribute ideas derived from other cadet papers to include:
  - Copying, rewriting, or paraphrasing the words of another student without documentation or attribution.
  - Changing words but copying the sentence structure and/or ideas of a source without giving credit.
  - Borrowing or consulting without attribution another student’s paper or consulting without attribution previously submitted papers from organizational files to assist with theory summaries, empirical evidence, or structuring arguments. NOTE: You must acknowledge assistance from any other cadet’s paper that you consult for an assignment, even if you do not quote or paraphrase from that paper.
  - Direct lifting or transferring text from websites, electronic files, and databases without placing that text in quotes and properly footnoting the source.

**Intentional misrepresentation is defined as the failure “to document assistance of another with the intent to deceive, mislead, gain, or give an unfair advantage...[to include] inventing sources, citing sources that were not actually consulted, or claiming the authority of a cited source which does not support that claim.”<sup>6</sup>** Even when such practices are committed without an intent to deceive, they are often failures of scholarly standards that warrant a reduction in grade. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Including a range of page numbers in a footnote or omitting page numbers in a footnote in order to obscure the true origin of an idea or source.
- Including a citation to a source without directly consulting the cited source.
- Including a citation (with or without page numbers) to a source that does not actually support the claim or idea you are attributing to it.
- Inventing page numbers without actually consulting the original source.
- Downplaying or obscuring the amount of information you’ve taken from a particular source despite the presence of a footnote or endnote.
- Downplaying or obscuring the extent of actual assistance you received (e.g. a vague claim indicating you used another cadet’s paper to “help with formatting” when you also used the paper to help structure your argument and obtain theoretical research.)
- Submitting your own previous academic work – whether in full or in part – from SS307 or any other class in the past or present semester without clearly documenting that you are reusing such work, a practice known as “self-plagiarism.” NOTE: resubmission of previous academic work is not allowed in SS307, even if properly documented.

**You are required to document all assistance and collaboration. Assistance includes:**

- Getting a verbal answer from another person about a specific point of confusion
- Obtaining help from someone to identify errors in your own solution

---

5. Ibid., 4

6. Ibid., 13



- Obtaining help from someone to fix the errors in your own solution
- Reading another cadet’s paper for ideas on structure or format
- Using another cadet’s paper to help with research, sources, and empirical evidence

If any keystroke or mouse click in your submission was done by another cadet, you have exceeded the limits of assistance and have engaged in collaboration. Assistance does not include receiving basic proof-reading assistance. However, extended proof reading assistance that substantially alters the style, format, organization, or grammatical correctness of your work does require formal acknowledgment and documentation.

**A note concerning intentional vs. unintentional plagiarism:** There are two related but independent facets to plagiarism and misrepresentation: one concerns ethics, the other concerns academic standards. It is often the case in instances of plagiarism that determining a cadet’s “intent to deceive” is the central focus of the Cadet Honor System proceedings. This recognizes the fact that plagiarism – insofar as it is a deliberate attempt to claim others’ work as your own – is an ethics violation of the lying and cheating clauses of the Cadet Honor Code. Thus, determining whether the cadet intended to deceive is a key function that is the purview of the institutions governing the Cadet Honor Code.

However, plagiarism is not only an ethical violation. It also represents a failure of academic standards and thus warrants a significant academic penalty separate from any findings by the Cadet Honor Process, IAW the DAW. When it comes to plagiarism as a failure of academic standards, the question of “intent” is secondary: regardless of whether there was intent to deceive, the examples of plagiarism and misrepresentation listed above represent substandard academic work. The assessment of the quality of academic work and the application of penalties for substandard work is the purview of USMA faculty members. Academic penalties are thus separate from any administrative penalties that may be imposed by USCC or the Cadet Honor Board.

The scale or severity of the academic penalty assessed for plagiarized or misrepresented work is likely to be much greater than a simple calculation of the percentage of text in the paper that is plagiarized. This is because every paper is evaluated holistically as the end product of a comprehensive research and writing process. Plagiarism seriously undermines that process and the legitimacy of the end product, even if only a small portion of the paper has been plagiarized. The grade penalty for plagiarized or misrepresented work reflects the seriousness of such academic misconduct accordingly.

# Part I Foundations of IR Theory

**A guide syllabus readings:** Readings labeled ‘Person FIR’ can be found in *Foundations of International Relations* (Robert Person, editor). Readings labeled ‘Handler CCR’ can be found in *International Politics: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Scott Handler, editor). A small number of readings should be downloaded from BlackBoard or accessed online using the link provided. Readings marked ‘recommended’ are optional but may provide useful background or additional depth to a subject.

## 1. Introduction (21/22 August)

Lesson objectives: *Understand what international relations (IR) is as an academic discipline and why it is an important subject for future Army officers. Understand the policies, requirements, and expectations of the course. Develop familiarity with the main theoretical traditions that dominate the contemporary study of international relations.*

- SS307 Syllabus
- Instructor guidance
- Stephen Walt. “International Relations: One World, Many Theories.” *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1998. **Person FIR, pages 5-19.**

## 2. The Theory and Science of Politics (23/24 August)

Lesson objectives: *What is ‘theory’ and why is it important in IR? What makes political science ‘scientific?’ How do social scientists use the scientific method to develop and test theories? What are the levels of analysis (‘images’) in IR theory, and how do we use them to understand why states do what they do?*

- John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt. “Leaving theory behind: why hypothesis testing has become bad for IR.” *European Journal of International Relations* 19, no. 3 (2013). **Person FIR, pages 23-33.**
- Kenneth R. Hoover and Todd Donovan. *The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*. Cengage Learning, 2011. **Handler CCR, pages 18-27.**
- Kenneth N. Waltz. *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. Columbia University Press, 2001. **Handler CCR, pages 29-32.**

## 3. Realism 1: Classical Realism (25/28 August)

Lesson objectives: *What is ‘anarchy’ in international system? Why, according to classical realists, do states seek power in the international system? What is power, and how much is ‘enough’ power according to classical realists like Morgenthau? How are the basic tenets of realism reflected in the Melian Dialogue? What is the realist view of morality in international relations?*

- Thomas Hobbes. “On the Nature and Condition of Man.” Chap. XIII in *Leviathan*. 1651. **Handler CCR, pages 33-35.**
- Hans Morgenthau. “A Realist Theory of International Politics.” In *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 7th ed. McGraw Hill, 2006. **Handler CCR, pages 41-44.**
- Joseph Nye. “The Peloponnesian War.” In *Understanding International Conflicts*, 6th ed. Pearson, 2007. **Handler CCR, pages 45-46.**
- Thucydides. “The Melian Dialogue.” In *The History of the Peloponnesian War*. 431 BCE. **Handler CCR, pages 159-162.**

#### 4. Realism 2: Neorealism (29/30 August)

Lesson objectives: *According to neorealists, how does the structure of the international system influence state behavior? Why does anarchy compel different types of states to behave similarly? What is the difference between security and power? How much power is ‘enough’ according to defensive realists (Waltz) vs. offensive realists (Mearsheimer)? Under what conditions do states cooperate according to neorealists? How does neorealism (sometimes called structural realism) differ from classical realism?*

- John Mearsheimer. “Realism.” In *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, Second edition. New York: WW Norton & Company, 2014. **Person FIR, pages 45-48.**
- Kenneth N Waltz. “The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory.” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, no. 4 (1988). **Handler CCR, pages 47-50.**
- John Mearsheimer. “Anarchy and the Struggle for Power.” In *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 1st ed. W.W. Norton, 2001. **Handler CCR, pages 51-58.**

#### 5. Realism 3: Balance of Power (31 August/1 September)

**Modified Schedule: 1 September, Beat Fordham**

Lesson objectives: *When and why do states engage in balancing behavior? Explain the difference between internal balancing and external balancing as strategies that states use to balance against other powers. How do different distributions or ‘balances’ of power (number of great powers in the system affect the likelihood of conflict in the international system? Why do some theorists believe that unipolarity is both stable and durable, while others believe it is highly unstable and war-prone?*

- Kenneth Waltz. “Balance of Power.” In *Theory of International Politics*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2010. **Person FIR, pages 53-55.**
- John Mearsheimer. “The Causes of Great Power War.” In *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, Second edition. New York: WW Norton & Company, 2014 . **Person FIR, pages 67-83.**
- William C. Wohlforth. “The Stability of a Unipolar World.” *International Security* 24, no. 1 (1999). **Person FIR, pages 87-96.**

#### 6. Workshop: Writing in Political Science (5/6 September)

Lesson objectives: *Understand the expectations and requirements for writing the SOSH Paper and its development assignments. Learn about what good writing looks like in political science, and learn tips for writing a successful paper.*

- Research and Analysis Paper (“SOSH Paper”) Prompt
- Henry Farrell. “Good Writing in Political Science,” 2013. **Handler CCR, pages 13-17.**

#### 7. Liberalism 1: Neoliberal Institutionalism (7/8 September)

Lesson objectives: *What do political scientists and economists mean when they use the term ‘institution?’ What is the difference between international institutions and international organizations, and what is the relationship between the two? What are the functions or mechanisms by which institutions facilitate cooperation? What are the key critiques of neoliberal institutionalism that have been put forward, often by realist IR theorists?*

- Scott Silverstone. “The Liberal Tradition and International Relations.” 2017. *Person FIR*, pages 99-104.
- Immanuel Kant. “Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch.” In *Essays and Treaties on Moral, Political, and Various Philosophical Subjects*. 1798. *Handler CCR*, pages 71-74.
- Douglass C. North. “An Introduction to Institutions and Institutional Change.” In *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press, October 26, 1990. *Person FIR*, pages 105-107.
- Robert O. Keohane. “International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?” *Foreign Policy*, no. 110 (1998). *Person FIR*, pages 109-118.

## 8. Liberalism 2: Economic Interdependence (11/12 September)

Lesson objectives: *Why, according to economic liberalism, does economic interdependence decrease the likelihood of conflict between trading partners? Why, contrary to the liberal vision of economic interdependence, do realists believe that economic interdependence might actually increase conflict among states? How does ‘trade expectations theory’ unify the insights of the liberal and realist views of interdependence?*

- Richard Rosecrance. “The Worlds of International Relations.” In *The Rise of the Trading State*. Basic Books, 1986. *Handler CCR*, pages 85-87.
- Dale C. Copeland. “Economic Interdependence and War: A Theory of Trade Expectations.” *International Security* 20, no. 4 (1996). *Handler CCR*, pages 88-90.
- Dale C. Copeland. “Economic Interdependence and War: A Theory of Trade Expectations.” *International Security* 20, no. 4 (1996) Read WWI and WWII case studies, p. 26-39 (**BlackBoard e-readings**)

## 9. Liberalism 3: The Democratic Peace (13/14 September)

**Modified Schedule: 13 September, Branch Week**

Lesson objectives: *Why, according to ‘democratic peace theory’ are democracies unlikely to go to war with other democracies? How does causal logic offered by the the ‘culturative-normative’ model differ from the ‘structural-institutional model’ of the democratic peace? What are the limits and critiques of democratic peace theory? Why are new democracies more war-prone than other regime types?*

- Bruce Russett. “The Fact of the Democratic Peace.” In *Grasping the Democratic Peace*. Princeton University Press, 1993. *Handler CCR*, pages 257-266.
- Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder. “Democratization and War.” *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 1995. *Handler CCR*, pages 267-272.
- Henry S. Farber and Joanne Gowa. “Politics and Peace.” *International Security* 20, no. 2 (1995). *Handler CCR*, pages 273-275.

## 10. Constructivism 1: Norms, Values, and Ideas (15/18 September)

**\*SOSH Paper proposal due: Monday, 18 September, 1600\***

Lesson objectives: *What are ‘norms’ and how do they differ from ‘taboos?’ According to constructivists, how do norms and values shape state behavior? How does the constructivist explanation of state behavior differ from the materialist approach taken by the realist and liberal traditions of IR theory? What do constructivists*

mean when they say that ‘anarchy is what states make of it?’ What is meant by the insight that ‘meaning is socially constructed,’ and how does that influence our understanding of international relations?

- Ian Hurd. “Constructivism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. Oxford University Press, 2008. **Person FIR, pages 121-128.**
- Nina Tannenwald. “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-use.” *International Organization* 53, no. 3 (1999). **Person FIR, pages 131-163.**

## 11. Constructivism 2: Identity (19/20 September)

Lesson objectives: *In the constructivist worldview, what is the relationship between culture, identity, and the behavior of states and individuals? If identity is ‘constructed,’ how is it constructed, by whom is it constructed, and for what purpose? How have the forces of national identity and nationalism shaped – and been shaped by – competition among states in the international system?*

- Ernest Gellner. “Nationalism.” In *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1964. **Person FIR, pages 167-174.**
- B.R. Posen. “Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power.” *International Security* 18, no. 2 (1993). **Person FIR, pages 175-184.**
- Amartya Sen. “The Violence of Illusion.” In *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. W.W. Norton, 2006. **Handler CCR, pages 129-134.**

## Part II Theories of Foreign Policy

### 12. Structure and Foreign Policy (21/22 September)

**\*Writ: Lesson 12 (21/22 September), in class\***

Lesson objectives: *What is the difference between a ‘systems theory of international politics’ and a ‘theory of foreign policy’ according to Waltz? What are the shortcomings of neorealism that ‘neoclassical realism’ seeks to address? What are the key insights offered by neoclassical realism about how states respond to external or ‘systemic’ stimuli? Why, according to neoclassical realists, do states sometimes act in ways that are different from what traditional structural realism (neorealism) would predict?*

- Kenneth Waltz. “Systems Theories of International Politics.” In *Theory of International Politics*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2010. **Person FIR, pages 189-190.**
- Norrin M Ripsman, Jeffrey W Taliaferro, and Steven E Lobell. *Neoclassical Realist Theory of International Politics*. Oxford University Press, 2016. **(BlackBoard e-readings)**

### 13. Domestic Theories of Foreign Policy (25/26 September)

Lesson objectives: *What are the various theoretical explanations that identify domestic political factors as a cause of war? If the causes of war are primarily domestic in nature, can state behavior be generalized beyond particular states at particular times? How do domestic political institutions in the United States shape the formulation and execution of American foreign policy?*

- Jack S. Levy. “Domestic Politics and War.” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, no. 4 (1988). **Person FIR, pages 193-213.**

- Michael Mastaduno. “The United States Political System and International Leadership.” In *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*, edited by G. John Ikenberry. New York: Longman, 1999. **Person FIR**, pages 215-231.

#### 14. Organizational and Bureaucratic Theories of Foreign Policy (27/28 September)

Lesson objectives: *Who or what are the key actors for each of the three decision making models (described by Allison)? What are the key deficiencies in the Rational Policy Model (RPM) that necessitate the use of the Org. Process Model (OPM) and the Bureaucratic Politics Model (BPM) to explain a state’s foreign policy output? Why, according to the OPM and the BPM, do governments sometimes take foreign policy actions that may be suboptimal solutions to the problem at hand?*

- Graham Allison. “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis.” *The American Political Science Review* 63, no. 3 (1969). (**BlackBoard e-readings**)

#### 15. Individual Theories of Foreign Policy (29 September/2 October)

Lesson objectives: *To what degree do individual political leaders shape foreign policy and the consequences thereof in international politics? Under what conditions are individual leaders most likely to influence international relations? How do insights into human rationality, psychology, and neurology inform our understanding of leaders’ foreign policy decisions? Do we really need to understand these individual-level factors in order to explain ‘why states do what they do?’*

- Daniel L. Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack. “Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In.” *International Security* 25, no. 4 (2001). **Person FIR**, pages 237-257.
- Janice Gross Stein. “Foreign Policy Decision Making: Rational, Psychological, and Neurological Models.” In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, edited by Steve Smith, Tim Dunne, and Amelia Hadfield. Oxford University Press, 2016. **Person FIR**, pages 259-275.

#### 16. Ethics in International Relations and Foreign Policy (3/4 October)

Lesson objectives: *Do the standards of individual morality also apply to the actions of states and statesmen? Should moral standards constrain state behavior? If the answer to these questions is affirmative, by what standards are we to judge the morality of a state’s actions? What are the main ethical schools of thought that influence international relations? What are the traditional ethical approaches used to evaluate whether an action is ethical?*

- James Fieser. *Normative Ethics*. 2009. **Handler CCR**, pages 163-167.
- Joseph Nye. “Ethical Questions and International Politics.” In *Understanding International Conflicts*, 6th ed. Pearson, 2007. **Handler CCR**, pages 168-173.
- George F. Kennan. “Morality and Foreign Policy.” *Foreign Affairs* 64, no. 2 (1985). **Person FIR**, pages 279-292.

## Part III Historical Cases in International Relations

### 17. The Origins of the State (5/6 October)

Lesson objectives: *What are the defining characteristics of the modern ‘state?’ Why is the Peace of Westphalia (1648) seen as the foundational moment in the rise of the sovereign territorial state and – by extension – the international state system? How did warfare shape the development of the modern state, and vice versa? Contrast war-centric explanations for state formation with economic and institutionalist explanations of state development. How should insights from early European state building inform our thinking about contemporary state building or re-building?*

- Hendrik Spruyt. “The Origins, Development, and Possible Decline of the Modern State.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 5, no. 1 (2002). **Person FIR, pages 297-312.**
- Paul Collier. “State Building and Nation Building.” In *Wars, Guns, and Votes: Democracy in Dangerous Places*. HarperCollins, 2009. **Handler CCR, pages 438-443.**

### 18. The First World War (10/11 October)

Lesson objectives: *What is the ‘security dilemma’ and what are the variables that influence its intensity or severity? In which of Jervis’ four worlds would we place Europe on the eve of WWI? What are the origins of the ‘cult of the offensive,’ and how did that ‘cult’ contribute to the outbreak of war in 1914? What lessons from WWI should inform our thinking about international politics today?*

- Robert Jervis. “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma.” *World Politics* 30, no. 2 (1978). **Handler CCR, pages 180-184.**
- Jack Snyder. “Civil-Military Relations and the Cult of the Offensive, 1914 and 1984.” *International Security* 9, no. 1 (1984). **Person FIR, pages 319-351.**
- Margaret MacMillan. *The Rhyme of History: Lessons of the Great War*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, December 18, 2013. **Person FIR, pages 353-375.**

### 19. Drop - WPR Compensation (12/13 October)

**\*WPR: All cadets will take the WPR on Friday, 13 October, Dean’s Hour. Location TBD. Course drop during regular class hours for Lesson 19.\***

### 20. The Interwar Period (16/17 October)

Lesson objectives: *Explain how Woodrow Wilson’s ‘Fourteen Points’ embody the liberal tradition of international relations. Based on the history offered by Bell, offer realist, liberal, and constructivist explanations for the failure to cement lasting peace and stability in Europe in the interwar period. Was the Second World War the inevitable consequence of the First World War and its flawed settlement? Explain the arguments for and against this proposition.*

- Woodrow Wilson. *The Fourteen Points*. Address to the U.S. Congress, January 8, 1918. **Handler CCR, pages 100-101.**
- P. M. H. Bell. “A Thirty Year’s War? The Disintegration of Europe.” In *The Origins of the Second World War in Europe*. Routledge, 2014. **Person FIR, pages 379-392.**

- P. M. H. Bell. “The Case Against a Thirty Year’s War: The Restoration of Europe.” In *The Origins of the Second World War in Europe*. Routledge, 2014. **Person FIR, pages 393-399.**

## 21. The Second World War (18/19 October)

Lesson objectives: *Who or what was responsible for causing the Second World War in Europe? Individuals like Hitler and Stalin? Domestic politics and ideologies of belligerent nations? Or systemic forces inherent in great power politics? Was the Japanese declaration of war on the United States an irrational act or the strategic calculus of a rational – but desperate – state. How does Copeland’s ‘trade expectations theory’ (Lesson 8) apply to WWII?*

- Randall L. Schweller. “Tripolarity and the Second World War.” *International Studies Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (1993). **(BlackBoard e-readings)**
- Scott D. Sagan. “The Origins of the Pacific War.” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, no. 4 (1988). **Person FIR, pages 443-472.**
- Review Copeland readings from Lesson 8

## 22. The Ethics of Nuclear Weapons: August 1945 (20/23 October)

**\*SOSH Paper outline due: Friday, 20 October, 1600\***

Lesson objectives: *Which ethical criteria are most appropriate for assessing the morality of nuclear weapons? What are the ethical arguments in favor of the use of nuclear weapons? What are the opposing arguments? Was the use of atomic weapons against Japan in 1945 morally justified?*

- Karl Compton. “If the Atomic Bomb Had Not Been Used.” *The Atlantic Monthly* 178 (12 1946). **Person FIR, pages 475-478.**
- Jim Holt. “Morality, Reduced to Arithmetic.” *New York Times*, August 5, 1995. **Handler CCR, pages 319-320.**
- Nobuo Hayashi. *On the Ethics of Nuclear Weapons* 2. UNIDIR NPT Review Conference, 2015. **(Black-Board e-readings)**
- Thomas C. Schelling. “Thinking about Nuclear Terrorism.” *International Security* 6, no. 4 (1982). **Person FIR, pages 479-481.**

## 23. The Postwar Order (24/25 October)

Lesson objectives: *Why did the United States construct a fundamentally liberal international order following WWII? What were the key institutions of that order, and how did they provide security and prosperity for the U.S. and its allies? Explain the role that an open global trading system played in cementing the postwar liberal order. Why, according to Krasner, are economic hegemons like the U.S. willing to bear the cost of establishing and maintaining an open trading system?*

- John Ikenberry. “The Rise of the American System.” In *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011. **Person FIR, Read pages 519-541, skim pages 542-558.**
- Stephen D. Krasner. “State Power and the Structure of International Trade.” *World Politics* 28, no. 3 (1976). **Handler CCR, pages 353-359.**



## 24. Cold War 1: Origins (26/27 October)

Lesson objectives: *Was the Cold War inevitable? On what grounds did the United States and the Soviet Union find each other threatening? To what degree was the hostility between the superpowers the product of competing ideologies and political-economic systems, as opposed to balance of power politics? Explain the theories of international relations that inform the policy of containment presented by Kennan in “The Sources of Soviet Conduct.”*

- George Kennan. “The Sources of Soviet Conduct.” *Foreign Affairs* 25, no. 4 (1947). **Person FIR, pages 485-501.**
- *NSC 68: A Report to the National Security Council on United States Objectives and Programs for National Security.* (Selections). U.S. Department of State Policy Planning Staff, 1950. **Person FIR, pages 503-515.**

## 25. Cold War 2: Security and Alliances (30/31 October)

**\*SOSH Paper draft due: Tuesday, 31 October, 1600\***

Lesson objectives: *What role did ‘insecurity’ play in shaping the post-WWII international order? What strategies did the United States and the Soviet Union employ to achieve security for themselves and their allies during the Cold War? Explain the logic of Walt’s ‘balance of threat’ theory and contrast that theory with traditional ‘balance of power’ theory. Apply BOT theory to explain post-WWII alliance structures.*

- Stephen M. Walt. “Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power.” *International Security* 9, no. 4 (1985). **Handler CCR, pages 202-207.**
- John Lewis Gaddis. “The Return of Fear.” In *The Cold War: A New History*. New York: Penguin, 2006. Pages 5-47 (**BlackBoard e-readings**)

## 26. Cold War 3: The “Long Peace” (1/2 November)

**\*SOSH Paper peer comments due: Thursday, 2 November, 1600\***

**Graham Allison guest lecture (mandatory): Thursday, 2 November, Dean’s Hour**

Lesson objectives: *Explain the logic of deterrence, as elaborated by Schelling. Why, according to Waltz, is bipolarity the most stable distribution of power in the international system? Use these two theories to explain the ‘long peace’ of the Cold War, a period characterized by the absence of great power war from 1945-1991. Why might some argue that the Cold War was anything but ‘peaceful’ despite (or perhaps because of) the logics of nuclear deterrence and the bipolarity of the system.*

- Kenneth Waltz. “The Stability of a Bipolar World.” *Daedalus*, 1964. **Person FIR, pages 561-584.**
- Thomas S. Schelling. “The Diplomacy of Violence.” In *Arms and Influence*. Yale University Press, 1966, 2008. **Handler CCR, pages 218-223.**

## 27. Brave New World: After the Cold War (3/6 November)

Lesson objectives: *Based on your knowledge of IR theory, explain why it is often said that neorealism failed to predict the end of the Cold War. Each author – Fukuyama, Huntington, and Barber – offers a different vision of the post-Cold War order and the sources of conflict therein. Explain each author’s argument about the sources of inter- and intra-state conflict after the Cold War, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of those arguments. With 25 years of hindsight, whose vision do you think came closest to describing reality?*

- Francis Fukuyama. “The End of History?” *The National Interest*, Summer 1989. **Handler CCR, pages 515-522.**
- Samuel P. Huntington. “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (1993). **Handler CCR, pages 530-537.**
- Benjamin Barber. “Jihad vs. McWorld.” *The Atlantic Monthly*, March 1992. **Handler CCR, pages 523-529.**

## 28. Drop - SOSH Paper Compensation (7/8 November)

## 29. Drop - SOSH Paper Due (9/13 November)

\*SOSH Paper Due: Thursday, 9 November, 1600\*

# Part IV Contemporary Challenges in International Relations

## 30. Nuclear Proliferation (14/15 November)

Lesson objectives: *Explain the arguments that Waltz offers for why nuclear proliferation ‘may be better.’ What implications does this argument have for nuclear programs in states like Iran and North Korea? Does the logic of deterrence and MAD apply to ‘rogue states’ as it did the superpowers during the Cold War? Explain Sagan’s counterarguments that more nuclear weapons (and nuclear-armed states) ‘will be worse.’ Which author’s arguments do you find more persuasive?*

- Kenneth N. Waltz. “Why Iran Should Get the Bomb.” *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2012 2012. **Person FIR, pages 591-594.**
- Scott D. Sagan. “The Perils of Proliferation: Organization Theory, Deterrence Theory, and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons.” *International Security* 18, no. 4 (1994). **Person FIR, pages 595-636.**
- (Skim) *Global Governance Report: Nuclear Proliferation Issue Brief*. Council on Foreign Relations, 2017. **Online:** <https://www.cfr.org/global-governance/global-governance-monitor/p18985#!/nuclear-proliferation>

## 31. September 11 and Terrorism (16/17 November)

Lesson objectives: *Describe the four waves of terrorism. Differentiate enabling conditions and motivations for terrorist movements. Has the fight against terrorism since September 11 been a success, a failure, or something in-between? What are the challenges to assessing progress and ‘success’ in counterterrorism?*

- Martha Crenshaw. “The Causes of Terrorism.” *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (1981). **Handler CCR, pages 296-299.**
- David C. Rapoport. “The Four Waves of Rebel Terror and September 11.” *Anthropoetics* 8 (1 2002). **Handler CCR, pages 291-295.**
- Brian Jenkins. “Fifteen Years On, Where Are We in the War on Terror?” *CTC Sentinel* 9 (9 2016). **Person FIR, pages 639-647.**

### 32. The Iraq War (20/21 November)

Lesson objectives: *Differentiate between preemptive war and preventive war, and explain how the logic of prevention and deterrence shaped the debate over invading Iraq. What role did intelligence failures play in leading America to war? How could these failures have been avoided or prevented in the future?*

- Jack S. Levy. "Preventive War and Democratic Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (2008). **Handler CCR, pages 192-196.**
- John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt. "An Unnecessary War." *Foreign Policy*, January/February 2003. **(BlackBoard e-readings)**
- Richard K. Betts. "Two Faces of Intelligence Failure: September 11 and Iraq's Missing WMD." *Political Science Quarterly* 122, no. 4 (2007). **(BlackBoard e-readings)**

### 33. Failed States and State Building (22/27 November)

**Modified Schedule: 22 November, Thanksgiving**

Lesson objectives: *What are the variety of functions that contemporary states often fill? What are the essential functions that a state must perform if it is to be considered a legitimate state? What is state building, why do we care about it, and how do we do it? What are the attributes of failed states, and how do such states threaten American and international security? Assess post-conflict state building in Iraq and Afghanistan in light of these insights.*

- Francis Fukuyama. "The Imperative of State-Building." *Journal of Democracy* 15, no. 2 (April 8, 2004). **Person FIR, pages 665-674.**
- Robert I. Rotberg. "Failed States in a World of Terror." *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 4 (2002). **Person FIR, pages 651-664.**
- James Traub. "Think Again: Failed States." *Foreign Policy*, June 20, 2011. **Person FIR, pages 677-681.**
- Marina Ottaway. "Think Again: Nation Building." *Foreign Policy*, November 9, 2009. **Person FIR, pages 683-689.**

### 34. Civil Wars (28/29 November)

Lesson objectives: *Explain the competing theoretical explanations on the causes of civil wars - which variables matter, and which don't? How does the concept of the 'security dilemma' contribute to our understanding of the causes and dynamics of ethnic conflict? Apply these theoretical insights to analyze the Syrian Civil War and associated sectarian conflict.*

- Stathis Kalyvas. "Civil Wars." In *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. **Person FIR, pages 693-708.**
- Barry R Posen. "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict." *Survival* 35, no. 1 (1993). **Person FIR, pages 713-721.**
- Benedetta Berti and Jonathan Paris. "Beyond sectarianism: Geopolitics, fragmentation, and the Syrian civil war." *Strategic Assessment* 16, no. 4 (2014). **Person FIR, pages 725-733.**

### 35. The Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention (30 November/1 December)

Lesson objectives: *Do states have a moral obligation to intervene in ongoing humanitarian crises, or to act to prevent such crises in the first place? What are the ethical arguments in favor of humanitarian intervention? What are the ethical arguments in favor of nonintervention? Is it possible to reconcile humanitarian ideals with geopolitical interests and principles of state sovereignty, whether in Syria, Libya, or elsewhere?*

- Aryeh Neier. “International Human Rights Law.” In *The International Human Rights Movement: A History*. Princeton University Press, 2012. **Person FIR, pages 741-750.**
- Mark R. Amstutz. “The Ethics of Foreign Intervention.” In *International Ethics: Concepts, Theories, and Cases in Global Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013. **Person FIR, pages 751-768.**
- Edward N. Luttwak. “Give War a Chance.” *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 1999. **Handler CCR, pages 288-290.**
- Stewart M. Patrick. “Does Syria Mean the End of the Responsibility to Protect?” *The Atlantic Monthly*, June 13, 2013. **Person FIR, pages 773-775.**

### 36. Globalization and Trade 1: Institutions and Interests (4/5 December)

Lesson objectives: *What is globalization? What is the relationship between international trade and globalization? Explain the liberal economic logic for trade. How do organizations and institutions like the World Trade Organization, regional trade agreements (like NAFTA), and bilateral trade agreements facilitate trade? Why has international trade been a cornerstone not just of U.S. economic policy, but also of U.S. security strategy since 1945?*

- Alan V Deardorff and Robert M Stern. “What you should know about globalization and the World Trade Organization.” *Review of International Economics* 10, no. 3 (2002). **Person FIR, pages 779-793.**
- Heather Hurlburt. “The Security Case for Trade.” *Foreign Affairs*, September 27, 2016. **Person FIR, pages 797-801.**

### 37. Globalization and Trade 2: Domestic Politics (6/7 December)

Lesson objectives: *Why is international trade often a controversial issue in domestic politics? Which sectors of the economy are likely to be ‘winners’ from international trade, and which are likely to be ‘losers?’ How do the demands of domestic interest groups interact with domestic political institutions to influence foreign economic policy? Explain how domestic interests and institutions influence the outcome of international trade negotiations*

- Robert D. Putnam. “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games.” *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988). **Handler CCR, pages 368-375.**
- Douglas Irwin. “The Truth About Trade.” *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 4 (2016). **Person FIR, pages 803-814.**
- Recommended: CFR backgrounder on trade policy and TPP, online: <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/trans-pacific-partnership-and-us-trade-policy>

### 38. Economic Sanctions and Financial Warfare (8/11 December)

#### Modified Schedule: 8 December, Beat Navy!

Lesson objectives: *Explain how sanctions and other instruments of financial warfare serve as tools of economic coercion. What purposes can economic sanctions serve when applied against adversaries? Under what conditions are sanctions likely to succeed in accomplishing their objective, and under what conditions are they likely to fail?*

- Juan C. Zarate. “Harnessing the Financial Furies: Smart Financial Power and National Security.” *The Washington Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (October 1, 2009). *Person FIR*, pages 817-826.
- Suzanne Maloney. “Why Iran Style Sanctions Worked Against Tehran,” March 21, 2014. *Person FIR*, pages 829-834.
- Emma Ashford. “Not-So-Smart Sanctions: The Failure of Western Restrictions against Russia.” *Foreign Affairs* 95 (2016). *Person FIR*, pages 835-844.
- Recommended: CFR Backgrounder on sanctions. Online: <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-are-economic-sanctions>

### 39. Integrated Analysis: Pivot to Asia (12/13 December)

Lesson objectives: *Use the entire toolkit of IR theory at your disposal to analyze and explain the United States’ ‘Pivot to Asia’ policy, announced by President Obama in 2011.*

- Hillary Clinton. “America’s Pacific Century.” *Foreign Policy*, October 11, 2011. Online: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/>
- Barack Obama. *Remarks by President Obama to the Australian Parliament*. Canberra, Australia, November 17, 2011. Online: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/17/remarks-president-obama-australian-parliament>
- Ashton Carter. *Remarks on the Next Phase of the U.S. Rebalance to the Asia-Pacific (McCain Institute, Arizona State University)*. Tempe, AZ, April 6, 2015. Online: <https://www.defense.gov/News/Speeches/Speech-View/Article/606660/remarks-on-the-next-phase-of-the-us-rebalance-to-the-asia-pacific-mccain-institut/>
- Barack Obama. *Remarks of President Obama to the People of Laos*. Vientiane, Laos, September 6, 2016. Online: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/09/06/remarks-president-obama-people-laos>
- Xi Jinping. *President Xi’s Speech to Davos in Full*. Davos, Switzerland, January 17, 2017. Online: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/full-text-of-xi-jinping-keynote-at-the-world-economic-forum>
- Xi Jinping. *Full text of President Xi’s speech at opening of Belt and Road forum*. Beijing, China, May 14, 2017. Online: [http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-05/14/c\\_136282982.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-05/14/c_136282982.htm)
- James Mattis. *Remarks by Secretary Mattis at Shangri-La Dialogue*. Singapore, June 3, 2017. Online: <https://www.defense.gov/News/Transcripts/Transcript-View/Article/1201780/remarks-by-secretary-mattis-at-shangri-la-dialogue/>

#### 40. The Future of American Power and the Liberal World Order (14/15 December)

Lesson objectives: *What is to become of the liberal international order in the 21st century as it faces increasing challenges? Is the liberal order destined to devolve back into the realpolitik of multipolar great power competition and conflict of the 19th and early 20th centuries? Is America a declining power? How should America contend with the rise of other powers in the 21st century?*

- Joseph S. Jr. Nye. “The Future of American Power: Dominance and Decline in Perspective.” *Foreign Affairs* 89 (2010). **Person FIR, pages 847-857.**
- G. John Ikenberry. “The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism After America.” *Foreign Affairs* 90, no. 3 (2011). **Person FIR, pages 859-871.**
- Hal Brands and Eric Edelman. “America and the Geopolitics of Upheaval.” *The National Interest*, June 21, 2017. **Online:** <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/america-the-geopolitics-upheaval-21258>