

Foundations of Strategic Studies

IR 385

Spring 2019

Instructor: Dr. Joshua R. Shiffrin

Office: 154 Bay State Road, #300

Email: jris@bu.edu

Office Hours: M, 2:30-5:00; W, 11-12; by appointment

Course Description

Why do states go to war? What is strategy, and what is its role in foreign policy? What causes non-state violent actors to form and thrive? What are nuclear weapons and why do they matter?

These and other questions fall under the broad penumbra of “strategic studies,” that is, the study of conflict, competition, the uses of force, and the array of domestic and international factors that influence such calculations in world politics. This class introduces students to some of the central concepts in security studies, with an emphasis on both traditional areas of inquiry and their contemporary manifestation. At a time when issues such as the rise of great powers, terrorism and insurgency, and nuclear weapons are increasingly central to policy discussions, we will use this course to analyze the reasons and manners in which actors compete and contemplate force in world politics; identify historical and theoretical literatures relating to security concerns; discuss the merits and limitations of existing research; apply these insights to ongoing policy debates; and develop analytic prisms through which to engage in future research and policy debates. We will do so using a combination of in-class discussion, case studies, and individual writing projects. Ultimately, we will synthesize and deploy both theoretical work and rigorous empirical work to engage security issues in the modern age.

As the preceding paragraph suggests, the course has only a little international economics in it and near nothing about international organizations. It focuses on states and, to a lesser extent, non-state actors that think about, plan for, and occasionally utilize force to pursue their ends. Sunshine, roses, and happy thoughts are not present in great abundance. This is the seedier side of international relations – the part that explains why the world wars occurred, what terrorism looks like, and what happens when countries like the United States attack others.

Why take such a course? The impulse to drawback from the brutality of conflict and competition is humane, and in the present era of relative peace and prosperity, natural. But the subject matter could not be more important, despite its dark nature. Discovering the drivers of war, the nature of military power, and the factors influencing the use of force throughout history will provide vital clues to navigating the problems of today and tomorrow. After all, during a similar period of peace during the nineteenth century, people could and did write that the problem of war was behind us. Things worked out rather differently. It will pay massive dividends to get our predictions right for the coming century, and this class will help you think about how to make them.

Prerequisites

- First-Year Writing Seminar (WR 100 or 120)

Hub Learning Outcomes

This course meets the learning outcomes for the following Hub areas: Writing Intensive, Social Inquiry II, and Critical Thinking.

By the end of this course, students will:

- Discover how to read critically to engage, dissect, and evaluate different texts – primarily from political science, international relations, and diplomatic/military history – discussing core topics in strategic studies, and apply this reading to engage policy debates surrounding the use of force (Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #2; Social Inquiry II Learning Outcome #2);
- Develop written reports evaluating approaches to strategy and strategic studies. Mobilizing evidence from theory and history, students will analyze past and potential future policy debates, highlight strengths and weaknesses to different courses of action, and construct theoretically- and historically-informed arguments to engage an array of issues in the strategic studies domain. (Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #1, Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes #1-2)
- Produce a range of written products, including policy reports; reaction papers; assessments of scholarly arguments/claims; and peer reviews. (Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #3).
- Engage foundational theoretical research and cases (see the course readings below, many of which are considered seminal studies) regarding strategic issues to assess historical and contemporary strategic issues (Critical Thinking Learning Outcome #2; Social Inquiry II Learning Outcome #2).
 - Decipher core texts (see reading list) to identify core logical claims, and the manners in which authors use evidence to evaluate theoretical claims (and vice versa) (Critical Thinking Learning Objective #1; Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #2)
- Enunciate core arguments emerging from existing research in strategic studies, identify strengths and limits to existing thoughts, and deploy such research in discussion with peers and colleagues (Critical Thinking Learning Outcome #1-2; Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #2).
- Grapple with and evaluate contemporary policy debates surrounding issue such as: great power competition/cooperation, foreign military intervention, covert action, and regime change.
 - Specific attention will be paid to what theory and evidence tell us about the likely course, conduct, and consequences of such activities, using historical research and international relations theory (Critical Thinking Learning Objective #1; Social Inquiry II Learning Outcome #1).
- Mobilize classroom-based sources and independent research to highlight the merits and drawbacks of alternate approaches to contemporary policy debates in the strategy arena. Students will connect insights from international relations theory and past experience to current political conditions (Social Inquiry Learning Outcome #1).
 - Students will thus be able to articulate the strengths, limits, and likely consequences – for better or for worse – of any given strategic debate. (Social Inquiry II Learning Outcome #2).

Instructional Format, Course Pedagogy, and Approach to Learning

This class will operate as a combination of active lecture and seminar-style discussion. Some sessions – particularly early each week when introducing new topics – the instructor will provide background, context, and expansion of class materials. Most of the time, however, students will be engaged in an active dialogue using Socratic discussion and a range of thematic and application question to facilitate student discussion of core concepts, examples, and contemporary applications. The ultimate objective is to have students embrace a range of theoretical arguments and historical examples, to apply these insights to current strategic discussions, and to prepare students for future scholarly research and policy analysis. In particular, lectures and discussions will focus on the “so what?” question – why theoretical research into strategy and strategic

studies and historical debates over these concepts matter for contemporary discussions – that will aid students’ ability to apply course content to social scientific inquiry and undertake research that expands upon assigned materials.

The reading load for this week is heavy but manageable, with most sessions requiring between 35 and 55 pages of reading (roughly 100-150 pages per week). In reading, you will note that many of the sessions are designed around a series of core theoretical, historical, and/or policy debates. The readings were selected to this effect, highlighting that (1) seemingly simple issues are not so cut-and-dry, and (2) strategic issues aggregate and blend – knowing about, e.g., civil-military relations can help us analyze military effectiveness (and vice versa). Class discussions will reflect these debates and participant reaction thereto. *Students should thus read with the idea of identifying different these debates and drawing connections across class themes. To do so, students should ask themselves what the origins (e.g., different sources of threat or solutions to threats) of these debates entail, what linkages across class topics they perceive, and consider which arguments they find most useful in understanding a given issue and why.* Read actively – don’t take the readings as providing an “answer” per se, but as providing entry into theoretical and policy discussions that are contested and – often – ongoing! Doing so will ensure a fluid and engaged classroom experience.

Requirements, Assignments, and Grading

The workload for this course is challenging. Again, there are roughly 100-150 pages of reading each week and between 35 and 55 per session; you are expected to complete them all. The reading emphasizes “classic” works of strategy and security analysis (broadly defined), well-vetted recent research, and a range of historical and policy readings to ensure concepts are applied to practice. This work *requires sustained effort to absorb* – you will need to be both diligent readers and good time managers. Plan accordingly!

Grades are assessed in five areas: class participation, online discussion posts, an in-class presentation and handout, a midterm exam, and a policy analysis paper. Weights and details on assignments are as follows:

Class participation (10 percent of course grade)

- It should go without saying that students are required to attend each class session except for a documented excuse (see below on attendance policy). Students may have two absences without any penalty. After the second absence, you will be docked 5 points from the final class grade for EACH additional unexcused absence.
- This class operates as an interactive seminar and discussion. It *cannot* succeed if students have not engaged course materials. Accordingly, students are expected to attend each class session having read, internalize, and interrogated assigned materials. While there is no one way to meet class participation, students are generally expected to (1) consume class readings, (2) come prepared to critique the arguments, and (3) think through how to deploy assigned materials to understand policy debates. I am hopeful that we can have a fruitful dialogue!
- To ensure students are comfortable with class participation, we will spend our first class session discussing how to read critically on strategic issues and, by allocating time each class session to reflecting on what was convincing or unconvincing about different readings, build on this effort throughout the semester (Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #2; Critical Thinking Learning Outcome #2).

- Students will schedule mid-semester meetings with the instructor to identify strengths and areas for improvement with regard to class participation. This will be done in conjunction with discussion of the online discussion posts (see below).

Of course, not all students are comfortable speaking in every seminar. Do not worry – quality of contribution is more important than quantity of contribution. I am looking for *thoughtful and insightful* comments that advance class discussion as a whole, show efforts to bring the different works read into discussion with one another, and apply the past to study the present. I am not looking for repetition of main themes, but also synthesis, critique, elaboration, and application. Do the readings for each class and come prepared to challenge me, your classmates, and yourselves on the basis of the material.

Online Discussion Posts (10 percent of course grade)

- To facilitate student synthesis of course materials, critical thinking, and application of course concepts, and to provide additional venues for class participation, twice a semester, each student (“Reactors”) is responsible for posting a *short* (NO MORE THAN 150 WORDS, i.e., a long paragraph) reaction to Blackboard (see the “Discussions” tab) in response to class readings. The task here is simple: pick a sentence or idea from one of the readings that you found particularly insightful/interesting/policy relevant, unpack what it says and how it relates to the arguments in the reading(s), and then explain why you find it provocative, disagreeable, essential, or otherwise worth noting. These reactions are due by **5PM the day before the class meets**, e.g., students posting on Monday’s class must post by 5PM on Sunday; first movers for Friday must post by 5PM on Thursday. In doing so, this exercise will help address Hub Critical Thinking Learning Outcome #1; Social Inquiry II Learning Outcome #1; Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #1.

The fun does not stop here! Each class, 2 other students (“Discussants”) will be responsible for discussing these posts; again, all students are responsible for performing this role twice each semester. Instead of writing a post, the job here is to stir up as much debate and discussion as possible on the board for that class. You can do this by disagreeing with people’s reactions; promoting an alternate frame for discussion; challenging underlying assumptions; bringing new facts or research to bear; or posting otherwise (intellectually) provocative material. You will have until **10 AM** on the day of class to do this. Note that *you do not have to respond to everyone on the board*, but it will probably require you to write several posts. On the other hand, a reactor does not have to get his/her post in at the same time as the other first movers; the reactor’s job is to drive the board discussion between the time the first mover’s post and the time the class meets. In doing so, this exercise will help address Hub Writing Intensive Learning Outcomes #1-2; Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes #1-2.

All students are encouraged to respond to others’ posts. **HOWEVER, you must post on the message board at least 10 times per semester.** Hopefully an organic discussion will emerge. I will be monitoring the discussion and using it to structure classroom sessions. **Be warned: you should not post something anodyne just to fulfill the posting requirement; as in class, quality is the measure of a successful contribution, though more posting obviously entails more participation.** Those who are more reticent about talking in public settings should take advantage of the online discussion to enhance their participation score. There will be a more detailed discussion of this exercise in class and on an additional handout.

Sign ups for serving as posters and/or reactors will occur after the first class session. Be warned, however: I reserve the right to move students around and change preferred roles as I see fit!

- Students will also schedule mid-semester meetings with the instructor to identify strengths and areas for improvement in both aspects of class participation. These will be done in conjunction with the discussion of class participation (see above).

Midterm (20 percent of course grade)

- There will be a take home midterm consisting of short-answer essay questions on Friday, March 1 covering material from the lectures and readings through the session on February 27. The midterm will be distributed during class on March 1, and due by the start of class on Monday, March 4.
- The exam will be open with respect to books, notes, and electronic equipment (laptops, smart phones, tablets etc.). However, coordination with other students is strictly prohibited and will result in a failing grade on the assignment and other penalties deemed appropriate by the Instructor.
- Further instructions will be given with the midterm itself. *We will also spend the class session on March 1 discussing how to write analytic essays.*
- This assignment will allow students to synthesize and apply material from the first half of the course, practice offering short and analytic treatments of core topics, and differentiate among competing theoretical and empirical arguments. It will therefore address Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes #1-2; Social Inquiry II Learning Outcome #1; Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #1.

Class Reading Handout & Presentation (20 percent of course grade)

- To strengthen students' communication and presentational skills, students will sign up to lead class presentations/discussions on designated class days (denoted by an * below) in teams of students.
- Presentations will consist of a BRIEF PowerPoint presentation (10 minutes) and a 2-page handout that will be circulated to the rest of the class.
 - This handout should (1) BRIEFLY (1-3 sentences) summarize core argument from each reading, (2) discuss common themes among the readings and/or debates among the authors (if applicable), (3) highlight areas of ambiguity in the arguments or issues that you feel authors are missing, and (4) identify at least one application to contemporary strategy or security debates.
 - In doing so, students will practice abstracting key concepts from longer materials and drawing logical and/or empirical connections among different pieces of scholarship, thus facilitating Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #1; Critical Thinking Learning Outcome #1.
 - Presentations will be anchored by a well-structured PowerPoint Presentation which includes all parts of the handout. That is, the presentation is NOT intended for students to review the readings in sequence. Instead, students are expected to (1) provide a *brief* (i.e., 2-3 minutes) overview of the major themes under discussion, (2) the conceptual debates that emerge from the history/theory readings, and (3) elaborate reasons why we, as policy students and analysts, should care.
 - Powerpoints should be emailed to the Instructor by 9 AM on the day of class.
- Presentations and handouts will be graded based on the quality of the substance as well as the clarity of the presentation/writing.
- Sign-ups for these exercises will be at the start of the semester. PLAN AHEAD!

Policy Analysis Paper (40 percent of course grade: 20 percent paper, 15 percent peer review, 5 percent draft)

- NOTE: This assignment will primarily span the last half of the course. The combined peer review and final report will enable students to read critically, identify and deploy relevant research materials, synthesize interdisciplinary work (i.e., theory and history) in support of a policy argument, familiarize students with the research and peer review process, and develop writing skills in several medium (peer review, outlines, policy papers). As such, it bears upon Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes #1-2; Writing Intensive Learning Outcome #1-2; Social Inquiry II Learning Outcomes #1-2.
- Pick a contemporary issue in the strategic studies landscape – nearly any issue facing any actor will do.
NOTE: an illustrative list of topics – not exhaustive! – can be found in Appendix 1 to this syllabus
- Now, pretend you have been tasked with coming up with solutions to this problem in a 1800-2100 (i.e., about 6-7 pgs) word paper.
- You must do so in several parts designed to practice applying and evaluating social science concepts to scholarly inquiry and policy research:
 - First, briefly review the history of the issue at hand – why is the issue an issue in the first place?
 - Next, applying concepts from the class and your own research into the topic (in consultation with instructor), describe 2-3 prospective solutions to the issue. These can be drawn from others' work or your own thinking on the issue.
 - Third, use course materials, outside theory readings (please consult instructor on the latter), and additional research into the specifics of the topic to assess the potential merits and drawbacks to the prospective solutions.
 - Finally, arrive at a recommendation: which (if any) of the solutions analyzed would you recommend pursuing, and why?
- This is not an easy assignment. To guide engagement, we will proceed in stages:
 - Please submit a 1 paragraph UNGRADED proposal identifying the topic you are interested in research. Use this opportunity to flag any questions you have with the assignment so that the instructor can help resolve outstanding ambiguities. The proposal is due Feb. 15 *Note that you may need to read ahead, conduct outside research, and/or consult the instructor for the proposal.*
 - The instructor will read these proposals, offer feedback, and – if needed – schedule individual meetings to work on these topics. This will facilitate students' research skills and
 - Second, students are required to submit a draft of their paper of at least 900 words to the instructor by March 30. This draft need NOT be a complete paper, but it should show extensive research and progress on the assignment – enough for a reader to grasp what your main arguments are or will likely be. This draft is worth 5 percent of the total course grade.
 - Students will then be paired to *review* one another's drafts/outlines and produce a 600-700 word memo (i.e., about 2 pages) offering feedback to their peers. The peer review memo should focus on offering feedback that crystallizes description of different strategies; strengthens the paper's core arguments by considering whether and what additional evidence/research is needed to generate a compelling assessment; and suggests ways to strengthen the writing. Students

should then incorporate this feedback in their final papers. This memo is due to both the partner and instructor by April 10 and worth 15 percent of the total course grade.

- *The instructor will then review the draft and peer review to offer additional feedback, lead a class discussion of the results of the writing assignment, and schedule meetings to discuss how to incorporate this input.*
 - *We will also hold an in-class discussion of the policy analysis paper and peer review process on April 12 in order to reflect upon the research and analysis process, discuss problems and solutions in the writing process, and model best practices.*
- Finally, the completed paper incorporating feedback from both the peer review and instructor is due on May 7 and worth 20 percent of your grade.

Grading Scale

90%-100%	A	Extraordinary, excellent work and mastery of concepts
80%-89%	B	Good work and solid command of concepts
70%-79%	C	Adequate work and sufficient understanding of concepts
60%-69%	D	Poor work, little understanding of concepts
0%-59%	F	Lack of work, no understanding of concepts

Books and Other Course Materials

All class materials are posted on Blackboard.

Courseware

All class materials are posted on Blackboard.

Office Hours and Meetings

As noted above, I will have office hours on Mondays (2:30-4:30), Wednesdays (1-3), and by appointment. Students are encouraged to reach out with questions, comments, or concerns with the course or class materials.

Students are welcome to drop by office hours without an appointment. However, students are *strongly* encouraged to make appointments to meet by logging in to jris.youcanbook.me in order to ensure we have time to address any concerns you may have.

As noted, students will also be required to schedule several meetings with the instructor at points during the semester to review written work and discuss class participating. Sign up sheets will be made available to facilitate this process.

Email Policy

Students should also feel free to email the instructor with questions or comments. Although I try to be diligent with email, travel, research, and other teaching obligations may preclude a speedy response. Accordingly, please allow *24-48 hours* for a response to any particular email. Students should plan accordingly: if one seeks advice on a paper, it is therefore not practical to email the night before!

Academic Integrity

All members of the University are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity, and the BU Academic Conduct Code will be strictly enforced. We must and shall hold one another to this standard. The Conduct Code can be found at:

<http://www.bu.edu/academics/policies/academic-conduct-code/>.

In addition, graduate students are expected to uphold the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences Academic Conduct Code. It is the responsibility of every graduate student to be aware of the Academic Conduct Code's contents and to abide by its provisions. The GRS Conduct Code can be found at:

<http://www.bu.edu/cas/current-students/phd-mfa-students/academic-policies-and-conduct-code/>

Statement on Equal Access

Boston University is committed to providing equal access to our coursework and programs to all students, including those with disabilities. In order to be sure that accommodations can be made in time for all exams and assignments, please plan to turn in your accommodations letter as soon as possible after the first class to the instructor. After you turn in your letter, please meet with me to discuss the plan for accommodations so that we can be sure that they are adequate and you are supported in your learning. If you have further questions or need additional support, please contact the Office of Disability Services (access@bu.edu).

Attendance & Absences

Attendance at all class sessions is mandatory, save in cases of a documented medical, family/personal, or religious exception (for additional details on BU's Absence Policy and Policy on Religious Observance, see: <https://www.bu.edu/academics/policies/attendance/> and <https://www.bu.edu/academics/policies/absence-for-religious-reasons/>).

If an absence is excused, the instructor may provide the student an opportunity to make up work that contributes to the final grade by a date agreed upon by the student and instructor; however, the make-up work must be completed in a timeframe not to exceed 30 calendar days from the last day of the initial absence.

Unexcused absences will result in significant deductions to your class participation grade. *Late arrivals* to class are also unacceptable and will be similarly penalized.

Please notify your instructor via email well in advance (i.e., at least 24 hours) of any absences.

Assignment Completion and Late Work

You are responsible for submitting your work on time (again, all assignments can be email to the instructor at jris@bu.edu). Whether this means crawling out of bed with the flu or having a friend deliver a paper, the onus is upon you. In the real world, as in this class, there are serious consequences for failing to meet your job requirements. Unless there is a documented medical or exigent personal circumstance, late assignments will be severely penalized: for each 24 hour period (starting immediately when the assignment is due) an assignment is late, I will reduce your grade by 15 points. This means that if your paper was due at 5 PM and you deliver an assignment at 6 PM, the best you can do on the paper is an 85 (a mid-tier B). If you deliver a paper at 6 PM the NEXT day, that's 30 points off (at best a C). Obviously it is better to receive a heavily penalized grade than to not hand in an assignment at all and receive a 0, but I STRONGLY recommend you plan to hand in your assignments on time to avoid the resulting penalties. I want you all to do well in this course!

READING LIST AND CALENDAR

1. Wednesday, January 23 – INTRODUCTION: How to Read and Engage on Strategy Issues

- Amelia Hoover Green, “How to Read Political Science: A Guide in Four Steps,” 2013, <https://www.ameliahoovergreen.com/uploads/9/3/0/9/93091546/howtoread.pdf>.
 - John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 2001), “Liberalism vs. Realism,” pp. 14-22.
2. Friday, January 25 – Why States Compete I: The Realist Tradition, Anarchy, and Power
 - Mearsheimer, *Tragedy*, Ch. 2, pp. 29-54.
 - Graham Allison, “How Trump and China’s Xi Could Stumble Into War,” *Washington Post*, March 31, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/03/31/how-trump-and-chinas-xi-could-stumble-into-war/?utm_term=.f33a05b6cfa6.
 3. Monday, January 28: Why States Compete II: Security Seeking and Military Technology
 - Robert Jervis, “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma,” *World Politics* 30, no. 2 (January 1978), pp. 167-214
 4. Wednesday, January 30: Why States Compete III: Domestic Politics*
 - Jack L. Snyder, *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 1-6, 31-60.
 - Christopher Layne, *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), Ch. 6, “Liberal Ideology and U.S. Grand Strategy,” pp. 118-133.
 - Vali Nasr, “The Iran Regime-Change Crew is Back,” *The Atlantic*, April 25, 2018, <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2018/04/iran-nuclear-deal-bolton-trump-regime-change/558785/>.
 5. Friday, February 1: Why States Compete IV: Misperception and Belief Systems*
 - Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War* (New York: Free Press, 1973), 1988 ed., pp. 35-56, 108-124.
 - Fiona Hill, “Mr. Putin and the Art of the Offensive Defense: Observations on the Crisis in Ukraine and Crimea” Brookings Institution, Part 1 (<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/mr-putin-and-the-art-of-the-offensive-defense-observations-on-the-crisis-in-ukraine-and-crimea-part-one/>) and Part 2 (<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/mr-putin-and-the-art-of-the-offensive-defense-approaches-to-foreign-policy-part-two/>), March 2014.
 6. Monday, February 4: Responding to Threats, I – Alliance Formation
 - Stephen M. Walt, “Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power,” *International Security* 9, no. 4 (Spring 1985), pp. 3-43
 - “US-Backed Quad Quietly Gains Steam as Way to Balance China,” *Bloomberg*, November 15, 2018, <https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/east-asia/us-backed-quad-quietly-gains-steam-as-way-to-balance-china>.
 7. Wednesday, February 6: Alliances in Practice - Historical Experience*
 - Glenn Snyder, “The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics,” *World Politics* 36, no. 4 (July 1984), pp. 461-479 ONLY
 - Mark Stoler, “The Grand Alliance in World War II” in *Grand Strategy and Military Alliances* (New York: Cambridge, 2016), ed. Peter Mansoor and Williamson Murray, pp. 136-165.

8. Friday, February 8: Alliances in Practice – Contemporary Debates
 - Jennifer Lind, “The Art of the Bluff: The U.S.-Japan Alliance under the Trump Administration,” H-Diplo/ISSF Policy Series, April 24, 2017, <https://networks.h-net.org/node/28443/discussions/176889/issf-policy-series-art-bluff-us-japan-alliance-under-trump>.
 - Sara Bjerg Moller, “Drawing the Line on U.S. Reassurance to Eastern Europe,” *Lawfare*, January 6, 2019, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/drawing-line-us-reassurance-eastern-europe>
 - Joshua Shiffrin, “Time to Consolidate NATO?” *The Washington Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2017), 109-123.

9. Monday, February 11: Responses to Threats, II: Arming and Military Doctrine
 - Barry Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1984), pp. 13-80

10. Wednesday, February 13: Arming (and Innovating) in Practice
 - Lorna Jaffe, *The Development of the Base Force* (Washington: Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1993), pp. 2-15, 35-50, online at: <http://www.orchestratingpower.org/lib/Military%20Force%20Structure/1989-1992%20baseforce.pdf>.
[NOTE: Jaffe’s piece is functionally only 25 pages]
 - Phil Haun, “Peacetime Military Innovation Through Inter-service Cooperation: The Unique Case of the U.S. Force and Battlefield Air Interdiction,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* (online first view, January 2019)

11. Friday, February 15: Arming in the Contemporary World – Debating U.S. Military Strategy*
(NOTE: POLICY ANALYSIS PAPER PROPOSAL DUE TODAY!)
 - U.S. Department of Defense, *National Defense Strategy of the United States* (Washington: Department of Defense, 2018), pp. 1-8, <https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2018-National-Defense-Strategy-Summary.pdf>.
 - Joshua Rovner, “AirSea Battle and Escalation Risks,” *U.S. Naval War College Changing Military Dynamics in East Asia Policy Brief No. 12*, January 2012, pp. 1-5, <https://cloudfront.escholarship.org/dist/prd/content/qt08m367zt/qt08m367zt.pdf?t=njxs4z>
 - Alexander Lanoszka and Michael Hunzeker, *Conventional Deterrence and Landpower in Northeastern Europe* (Carlisle: U.S. Army War College, forthcoming), pp 72-95.
 - **NOTE:** Students may also wish to consult Alexander Lanoszka and Michael Hunzeker, “Confronting the Anti-Access/Area Denial and Precision Strike Challenge in the Baltic Region,” *RUSI Journal* 161, no. 5 (October-November 2016), pp. 12-18, <http://alexlanoszka.com/LanoszkaHunzekerRUSI2016.pdf>.

PRESIDENT’S DAY – NO CLASS, MONDAY, February 18

12. Tuesday, February 19 [SUBSTITUTE MONDAY CLASS]: Debating the Merits of Arming and Allying
 - [No readings – in-class review and discussion of concepts covered to date and how to apply them to policy issues]

13. Wednesday, February 20: The Concept of Grand Strategy

- Hal Brands, *What Good Is Grand Strategy?* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014), pp. 1-16.

14. Friday, February 22: Grand Strategy and Its Importance

- **PICK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING TWO:**
 - Barry Posen and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy,” *International Security* 21, no. 3 (Winter 1996-1997), pp. 5-23, 32-43.
 - OR**
 - Paul Avey, Jonathan Markowitz and Robert Reardon, “Disentangling Grand Strategy: International Relations Theory and U.S. Grand Strategy,” *Texas National Security Review* 2, no. 1 (November 2018), <https://tnsr.org/2018/11/disentangling-grand-strategy-international-relations-theory-and-u-s-grand-strategy/>.
- Barry Posen, “The Rise of Illiberal Hegemony,” *Foreign Affairs* 97, no. 2 (March/April 2018), pp. 20-27
- **RECOMMENDED:** Rebecca Lissner, “What Is Grand Strategy? Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield,” *Texas National Security Review* 2, no. 1 (November 2018), <https://tnsr.org/2018/11/what-is-grand-strategy-sweeping-a-conceptual-minefield/>.

15. Monday, February 25: Grand Strategy, Its Problems, and Its Discontents*

- Eliot Cohen, *The Big Stick: The Limits of Soft Power and the Necessity of Military Force* (New York Basic, 2016), pp. 203-206.
- David M. Edelstein and Ronald Krebs, “Delusions of Grand Strategy,” *Foreign Affairs* 94, no. 6 (November/December 2015), pp. 109-116.
- Benjamin Friedman and Justin Logan, “Why Washington Doesn’t Debate Grand Strategy,” *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Winter 2016), pp. 14-35
- **RECOMMENDED:** Robert Jervis, “U.S. Grand Strategy: Mission Impossible,” *Naval War College Review* 51, no. 3 (Summer 1998), pp. 22-36.

16. Wednesday, February 27: Uses of Force

- Robert J. Art, “To What Ends Military Power?” *International Security* 4, no. 4 (Spring 1980), pp. 3-27 ONLY
- Ahsan Butt, “Why Did the United States Invade Iraq in 2003?” *Security Studies* (online first view, January 2019), pp. 1-9, 14-33 ONLY.

17. Friday, March 1 – IN-CLASS DISCUSSION OF WRITING ANALYTIC ESSAYS (Midterm Distributed)

18. Monday, March 4: The Logic of Deterrence and Coercion, I

- Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven: Yale, 1966), pp. 35-59, 63-91.

19. Wednesday, March 6: The Logic of Deterrence and Coercion, II

- Phil Haun, *Coercion, Survival and War: Why Weak States Resist the Strong* (Stanford: Stanford, 2015), pp. 11-31, 49-72.
- **RECOMMENDED:** Robert A. Pape, *Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), pp. 12-38.

20. Friday, March 8: When Deterrence and Coercion Blend

- Scott D. Sagan, “From Deterrence, to Coercion, to War: The Road to Pearl Harbor,” in Alexander George and William Simmons, eds., *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*, 2nd edition, (Boulder: Westview, 1994), pp. 57-85.
21. Monday, March 18: Waging War: Theory and Practice of Force Employment (Ground)
- Stephen Biddle, *Military Power* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), pp. 28-51, 132-149
 - Richard Andres, Craig Wills, and Thomas E. Griffith, Jr., “Winning with Allies: The Strategic Value of the Afghan Model,” *International Security* 30, no. 3 (Winter 2005-2006), pp. 124-135 ONLY.
 - **NOTE 1:** Students unfamiliar with military forces may wish to skim portions of the following as background:
 - James Dunnigan, *How to Make War* (New York: Quill, 2003) [on reserve at Mugar Library]
 - Congressional Research Service (CRS) Primers – all are short (1-3 pages):
 - “Organization of U.S. Ground Forces,” November 16, 2018 - <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF10571.pdf>
 - “Naval Forces,” November 8, 2018 - <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF10486.pdf>
 - “The United States Air Force,” November 7, 2018, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF10547.pdf>
 - “Strategic Nuclear Forces,” November 29, 2016, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF10519.pdf>
 - “Geography, Strategy, and U.S. Force Design,” November 8, 2018, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF10485.pdf>
 - **NOTE 2:** *We will view the opening minutes from the film Saving Private Ryan during the class session. The opening is violent and occasionally graphic. Students who feel this material will be problematic should reach out so we can make appropriate accommodations.*
22. Wednesday, March 20: Waging War: Theory and Practice of Force Employment, (Air Power)
- Robert Pape, “Coercive Airpower in the Vietnam War,” *International Security* 15, no. 2 (Fall 1990), 103-146.
 - **RECOMMENDED:** Phil Haun and Colin Jackson, “Breaker of Armies: Air Power in the Easter Offensive and the Myth of Linebacker I and II in the Vietnam War,” *International Security* 40, no. 3 (Winter 2015-2016), pp. 139-178.
23. Friday, March 22: Waging War: Theory and Practice of Force Employment (Naval)
- Sean Mirski, “Stranglehold: The Context, Conduct, and Consequences of an American Naval Blockade of China,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* 36, no. 3 pp. 385-421.
 - Michael Beckley, “Balancing China: How the United States and Its Partners Can Check Chinese Naval Expansion,” *War on the Rocks*, November 15, 2017, <https://warontherocks.com/2017/11/balancing-china-united-states-partners-can-check-chinese-naval-expansion/>.
24. Monday, March 25: Waging War: Contemporary Debates*
- Review Beckley from March 22 session & Lanoszka/Hunzecker from February 11 session.

- Caitlin Talmadge, “Beijing’s Nuclear Option,” *Foreign Affairs* 97, no. 6 (November/December 2018), <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option>.
25. Wednesday, March 27: Civil-Military Relations: Conceptual Matters I
- Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 7-18, 80-98
26. Friday, March 29: Civil-Military Relations: Conceptual Matters II
(**NOTE: DRAFT POLICY ANALYSIS PAPER DUE. MARCH 30**)
- Lindsey Cohn, “The Precarious State of Civil-Military Relations in the Age of Trump,” *War on the Rocks*, March 28, 2018, <https://warontherocks.com/2018/03/the-precious-state-of-civil-military-relations-in-the-age-of-trump/>
 - Mara Karlin and Alice Hunt Friend, “Military Worship Hurts US Democracy,” *Brookings Brief*, September 24, 2018, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/09/24/military-worship-hurts-us-democracy/>.
27. Monday, April 1: The Importance of Civil-Military Relations*
- Jack Snyder, “Civil-Military Relations and the Cult of the Offensive,” *International Security* 9, no. 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 108-129 ONLY (pp. 129-146 RECOMMENDED)
 - Risa Brooks, “An Autocracy at War: Explaining Egypt’s Military Effectiveness, 1967 and 1973,” *Security Studies* 15, no. 3 (Fall 2006), pp. 396-430
28. Wednesday, April 3: Intelligence-Policymaker Relations – Spies, Lies, and Policy*
- **NOTE:** For background on different intelligence instruments and organizations, students may wish to consult Marshall Erwin, “Intelligence Issues for Congress,” Congressional Research Service Report RL33539, April 23, 2013, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL33539.pdf>.
 - Joshua Rovner, *Fixing the Facts* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011), pp. 18-48 (chap. 2-3)
 - Richard Betts, “Analysis, War, and Decisions: Why Intelligence Failures are Inevitable,” *World Politics* 31, no. 1 (October 1978), pp. 61-80 ONLY.
29. Friday, April 5: Intelligence-Policymaker Relations – Consequences*
- Richard Immerman, “Intelligence and the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars,” *Political Science Quarterly* 131, no. 3 (2016), pp. 477-500
 - Roberta Wohlstetter, *Pearl Harbor: Warning and Decision* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), pp. 382-401.
 - Joshua Rovner, “Donald Trump and the Future of Intelligence,” *Lawfare*, January 8, 2017, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/donald-trump-and-future-intelligence>.
30. Monday, April 8: Nuclear Weapons and the Nuclear Revolution*
- Robert Jervis, “The Nuclear Revolution and the Common Defense,” *Political Science Quarterly*, pp. 689-703.
 - Mark Bell, “Beyond Emboldenment: How Acquiring Nuclear Weapons Can Change Foreign Policy,” *International Security* 40, no. 1 (Summer 2015), pp. 87-119
- NOTE:** Students may wish to consult Congressional Research Service, “Strategic Nuclear Forces,” November 29, 2016, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF10519.pdf> for background on technical aspects of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems

31. Wednesday, April 10: Nuclear Politics in the Contemporary World
(NOTE: PEER REVIEW OF POLICY ANALYSIS PAPER DUE)

- Vipin Narang, “Nuclear Strategies of Emerging Nuclear Powers: North Korea and Iran,” *The Washington Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (Spring 2015), pp. 73-89.
- Eric S. Edelman, Andrew F. Krepinevich, and Evan Braden Montgomery, “The Dangers of a Nuclear Iran: The Limits of Containment,” *Foreign Affairs* 90, no. 1 (January/February 2011), pp. 66-81.
- Ankit Panda and Vipin Narang, “Diplomacy without Denuclearization: North Korea in 2018,” *War on the Rocks*, December 24, 2018, <https://warontherocks.com/2018/12/diplomacy-without-denuclearization-north-korea-in-2018/>

32. Friday, April 12: In-Class Discussion of Policy Analysis Papers and Peer Reviews

Monday, April 15 [NO CLASS – PATRIOTS DAY]

33. Wednesday, April 17: Civil Wars – Causes*

- James Fearon and David Laitin, “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War,” *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (February 2003), pp. 75-90.
- Barry Posen, “The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict,” *Survival* 35, no.1, (Winter 1993), pp. 27-47.

34. Friday, April 19: Civil Wars – “Solutions”*

- Edward Luttwak, “Give War a Chance,” *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (July/August 1999), pp. 36-44.
- Alan Kuperman, “Rwanda in Retrospect,” *Foreign Affairs* 79, no. 1 (January-February 2000), pp. 94-118.
- James Kurth, “Lessons from the Past Decade,” *Orbis* (Fall 2001), pp. 569-578.

35. Monday, April 22: Terrorism – Concepts*

- Martha Crenshaw, “The Causes of Terrorism,” *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (July 1981), pp. 379-399.
 - John Mueller, “Six Rather Unusual Propositions about Terrorism,” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 17, no. 4 (2005), pp. 487-505.
- NOTE:** Students interested in this topic may also wish to consult Andrew Kydd and Barbara Walter, “The Strategies of Terrorism,” *International Security* 31, no. 1 (Summer 2006), pp. 49-80.

36. Wednesday, April 24: Counterterrorism*

- Barry Posen, “The Struggle Against Terrorism: Grand Strategy, Strategy, and Tactics,” *International Security* 26, no. 3 (Winter 2001-2002), pp. 39-55
- Paul Pillar, “Counterterrorism after Al Qaeda,” *The Washington Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (Summer 2004), pp. 101-113.

37. Friday, April 26: Mass and Forced Migration*

- Kelly M. Greenhill, “Migration as a Coercive Weapon: New Evidence from the Middle East,” in *Coercion: The Power to Hurt in International Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), ed. Kelly Greenhill and Peter Krause, pp. 204-227, available

online via BU Library: https://buprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=ALMA_BOSU151907569800001161&context=L&vid=BU&lang=en_US&search_scope=default_scope&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=default_tab&query=any_contains_greenhill%20krause%20coercion&sortby=rank&offset=0

38. Monday, April 29: Security Studies: Back to the Future?

- Austin Long, Linda Robinson, and Seth Jones, “Managing Chaos in an Era of Great Power Competition,” *War on the Rocks*, September 5, 2017, <https://warontherocks.com/2017/09/managing-chaos-in-an-era-of-great-power-competition/>.

39. Wednesday, May 1: Wrap Up

(NOTE: POLICY ANALYSIS PAPER DUE MAY 7)

Appendix 1

Illustrative Paper Topics

This is a **non-exhaustive list** of some contemporary issues that students may want to engage for their papers:

- Options for managing U.S. security commitments (regionally or globally)
- What options exist for the U.S. to ‘manage’ China’s rise? To deter Chinese aggrandizement?
- What options exist for China to manage the United States’ decline/its own rise? To deter American preventive conflict?
- What options exist for the U.S. to reshape its grand strategy given shifts in the distribution of power?
- What are some policies to address Russian assertiveness in Eastern Europe? What are some Russian options for countering the American/European response?
- How might Russia prepare to overcome NATO’s containment efforts? How might NATO prepare to defend its Eastern flank against Russia?
- What options exist for the EU in forging a better foreign/defense policy? For managing relations with the U.S.?
- What are some possibilities to manage any of an array of problems (e.g., Shiite-Sunni tensions, Arab-Israeli tensions, fundamentalist Islamist terrorism, etc.) in the Middle East?
- What can local and/or external states (IGOs? NGOs?) do to address state weakness in the Horn of Africa?
- To what extent is terrorism (or a specific subset of terrorism) a security threat to (pick an actor) and what options exist to address the threat?
- What are some solutions for addressing the ongoing insurgency in Afghanistan?
- What problems and solutions exist in the U.S. (or another actor’s)
- How can the United States deter North Korea (or, how can North Korea deter the United States)?
- How can Pakistan deter India (or vice versa)?
- What can the international community do to halt nuclear proliferation in the Middle East (East Asia) given concerns with Iran (North Korea)? [Alternative option: preventing nuclear proliferation from weak or fragile states like Pakistan]
- How and to what extent does environmental change increase the risk of war? State failure? Civil war? What solutions are there to mitigate the security consequences of environmental change?

- Many analysts argue that the United States' veneration of its military has deleterious consequences for U.S. civil-military relations. What are some solutions to address one or more of these problems?
- Given the rise of cyber security, what solutions might Country X employ to address its cyber vulnerabilities? [Students will need to pick a country]
- What are the security problems associated with forced migration, and what can members of the international community (or targeted countries) do to address these problems?
- States occasionally intervene in other countries' domestic conflicts (civil wars, insurgency, etc.) purposes, yet often lack the requisite capabilities to do so effectively. Keeping a particular state and type of contingency in mind, what options exist to address this capabilities gap?