

The University of Texas at Austin  
Government 360N (38995)  
International Security  
Spring 2011, MWF 10-11, PAR 1

Patrick J. McDonald  
BAT 4.136  
512.232.1747  
pjmcDonald@austin.utexas.edu  
Office hours: M 11-12, 1.30-3.30

TA: Daniel McCormack  
mccormackdm@mail.utexas.edu  
BAT 1.118  
Office hours: Th F 8-9.30

## DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to provide you with a broad introduction to the conditions and motivations behind the use of military force in the contemporary political world. Traditionally, this subfield in international relations has focused on how states use or threaten to use violence to preserve their sovereignty and resolve political conflicts with other states. We will begin by examining how the anarchical structure of the international system constrains a state's ability to meet these responsibilities. This discussion will then lead into an examination of the origins of war between states and nuclear deterrence theory. After these sections, we will explore whether the task of protecting national security has changed in the post-Cold War and post-9/11 worlds.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

There will be four requirements for this course. First, you will be expected to attend class, keep up with the assigned readings, participate in our discussions, and complete regular in-class quizzes. Second, an in-class examination will be given on *Monday, February 15*. Third, a paper will be due on *Friday, March 12*. Fourth, a take-home final will be due at *noon on Friday, May 13* (our scheduled final examination time). These requirements will provide the following components of your final grade:

Attendance, participation, reading journals, and quizzes	25%
Exam 1	20%
Paper	25%
Take-home final exam	30%

## READING MATERIALS

The reading material for this course will be made available through two primary formats. First, electronic copies of all readings except from the assigned books will be available from our course's blackboard site (access through [courses.utexas.edu](http://courses.utexas.edu)). Second, the following required texts are available at the University Co-op bookstore.

David Fromkin. 2004. *Europe's Last Summer: Who Started the Great War in 1914?* New York: Knopf.

## **COURSE GOALS**

Relative to other large classes at UT, this will be a discussion heavy class. I normally lecture for about one-half to two-thirds of our class time. You will be given repeated opportunities to engage with me, the TA, and your fellow classmates over the issues we cover. I strongly believe that students take more away from this class when granted such opportunities for active learning.

I want to use the subject material of our course to get you thinking (i.e. criticizing, applying, extending) about explanatory “models” of international politics that generate intellectual leverage, or quite simply can explain broad patterns of social behavior with just a few variables or concepts. This might be new for many of you. This is not going to be a class designed to get you to memorize a bunch of facts about international relations so that you can succeed on a multiple choice exam. It is not about giving you the answers. I instead I will raise challenging questions that have been debated (sometimes quite ineffectively) for centuries and then teach one style by which you can generate your *own* answers. In short, you will be graded on the effectiveness of your original, written arguments—not on whether you can regurgitate what you have read or what I have said.

Build on this broad teaching approach, here is a set of more specific goals for our semester.

1. Enhance your understanding of the big questions in the study of international politics. Drawing on a variety of theoretical approaches, we will explore such questions as: Why do states go to war? Does nuclear proliferation enhance or diminish international stability? Under what conditions do civil wars occur? Does terrorism provide a unique challenge to sovereign states? Does globalization enhance or diminish national security? What strategies should the United States adopt to cope with traditional and emerging threats to its political interests?
2. Enhance your ability to think in the abstract i.e. theoretically. All of our discussions and your written assignments will be oriented around this.
3. Sharpen your reading skills. The goal of your reading should not be to finish the article or the chapter. Instead it should be to prepare yourself to think critically and originally about the questions, theoretical claims, evidence, and implications of the material you have read. To this end, you will complete a series of short writing assignments designed to get you ready to participate actively in class discussions on our readings.
4. Sharpen your writing skills. You will get to practice this often—both in short assignments of (200 to 300 words) and longer essays (1500 to 2000 words). You will be asked to follow the basic format (handout will be given on this) that most political scientists now utilize to present their arguments.

## **COURSE POLICIES**

Our class format necessarily creates mutual obligations among students to come prepared to discuss both the readings and the lecture materials. If only a few people in a group or the class are regularly doing the reading, our discussions will stumble as the bulk of students rely on a minority to carry them. Such a situation penalizes those students doing the readings as they then are pushed to shoulder more responsibility in class. To avoid this situation while fostering a stimulating and productive intellectual environment in class, I have established the following rules to ensure that all students meet these obligations to each other.

## **COURSE POLICIES (CTD)**

*Attendance and participation...* will be tracked daily throughout the semester with two mechanisms—random quizzes and group discussion work. The quizzes will be comprised of two parts. The first part will include a small number of multiple choice questions (around five) based on the assigned readings for the day and/or the previous lecture. The second component will be your entry from that day's reading journal assignment.

*Reading journals* will be checked randomly throughout the semester as part of the in-class quizzes. You will write 100-150 word summaries of each reading that is marked by an asterisk (\*) in the syllabus. These summaries should identify the key question that the author is trying to answer, the primary theoretical argument by the author(s), and a sample of the most important empirical evidence the author offers for his/her claims. Your summary of the theoretical argument should include the independent (or causal) variable, what the dependent (or thing to be explained is), and the causal mechanism(s) that link the independent and dependent variables. These summaries should be typed and ready to be turned in at every class. If you do not have the assignments with you to be turned in when quizzes are collected, you will not receive credit for that portion of the quiz.

You will be expected to *participate* in class discussions and demonstrate that you have done the readings by performing such tasks as summarizing the main arguments, critiquing an author's claims, drawing out policy implications, suggesting how an author's argument may apply to another issue area, or highlighting similarities and differences with other readings. Class participation will be monitored via regular small group work. The makeup of these groups will change regularly throughout the semester according to quiz grades. Students that regularly come to class and keep up with the assigned readings will be put into discussion groups with other students that keep up with the readings. Students that do not keep up with the assigned readings will be placed into groups with other students that do not keep up with the assigned readings.

*Attendance and participation points cannot be made up under any circumstances, including excused absences.* However, each student in the class will receive a one time bonus at the end of the semester of two times the average daily points for this component of your grade. For example, if there are 150 attendance and participation points for the semester and these points were checked on 25 class days, then the average daily point total is six. All students would receive a bonus of 12 points to account for excused and unexcused absences.

*Lateness...* If you come late to class and miss an attendance check (sign-in sheet, quiz, journal collection), you have missed the attendance check for that day. Please do not ask to have your assignment collected.

*The determination of grades and grade appeals...* This process must be initiated by your written explanation of why the decisions behind the assignment of your grade should be revisited. You will have one week after an assignment has been handed back to submit this written explanation. After that period, all grades will be considered final and any discussion that we might have will be restricted to how you can do better on the next assignment. Once you have submitted your written request, I will decide whether to regrade your entire assignment.

Please keep in mind that your past performance in other classes taken here at the University is not germane to any grading decisions made in my class. Consequently, if receiving a D in my class places you on academic probation, this does not constitute a viable justification for requesting the regrading of any assignment.

## **COURSE POLICIES (CTD)**

**Grade appeals also cannot be made on the basis of being “close” to a letter grade. Cutoffs between letter grades will be strictly observed according to guidelines listed below. Note: these already include appropriate rounding:**

92.5-100 A; 89.5-92.5 A-; 86.5-89.5 B+; 82.5-86.5 B; 79.5-82.5 B-; 76.5-79.5 C+; 72.5-76.5 C; 69.5-72.5 C-; 66.5-69.5 D+; 62.5-66.5 D; 59.5-62.5 D-; 0-59.5 F

*“Scholastic dishonesty...includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, collusion, falsifying academic records, and any act designed to give unfair academic advantage to the student (such as, but not limited to, submission of essentially the same written assignment for two courses without prior permission of the instructor, providing false or misleading information in an effort to receive a postponement or an extension on a test, quiz, or other assignment), or the attempt to commit such an act”* (Section 11-802 (b), *Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities*).

If you have any questions about what constitutes scholastic dishonesty, you should consult with me and the following website (<http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/academicintegrity.html>). Any student that violates this policy will fail this course and have the details of the violation reported to Student Judicial Services.

*Religious holidays:* By UT Austin policy, you must notify me of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

*Emergency evacuation:* In the event of a fire or other emergency, it may be necessary to evacuate a building rapidly. Upon the activation of a fire alarm or the announcement of an emergency in a university building, all occupants of the building are required to evacuate and assemble outside. Once evacuated, no one may re-enter the building without instruction to do so from the Austin Fire Department, University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.

Students should familiarize themselves with all the exit doors of each room and building they occupy at the university, and should remember that the nearest exit routes may not be the same as they way they typically enter buildings.

Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructors in writing during the first week of class. Faculty members must then provide this information to the Fire Prevention Services office by fax (512-232-2759), with "Attn. Mr. Roosevelt Easley" written in the subject line.

Information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at <http://www.utexas.edu/emergency>.

*Changes to the syllabus...*I may make minor changes to the syllabus. These will be announced at least a week in advance.

*Makeup midterm exams...*will only be offered in the advent of an extreme and verifiable medical or family emergency (to be determined in consultation with me and the Office of the Dean of Students).

## **CLASS SCHEDULE**

Wednesday, 1/19

Introduction: Thinking theoretically about international relations

### **I. National Security in the pre-nuclear era**

Friday, 1/21

Force and politics

Bates, *When Things Fell Apart*, pp. 3-29.

Wagner, R. Harrison. *War and the State: The Theory of International Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 105-129.

Monday, 1/24

Anarchy in International Politics

Kenneth Waltz, "The Anarchic Structure of World Politics," in Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis, *International Politics*, 9<sup>th</sup> edition, pp. 29-49. New York: Pearson Longman.

Wednesday, 1/26

The Security Dilemma

\*Robert Jervis. 1978. Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma. *World Politics* 30(2): 167-214.

Friday, 1/28

Alliances

\*Glenn Snyder. 1984. The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics. *World Politics* 36(4): 461-495.

Monday, 1/31

International Institutions and Collective Security

\*Charles A. Kupchan and Clifford A. Kupchan. 1995. The Promise of Collective Security. *International Security* 20(1): 52-61.

## II. Origins of War

Wednesday, 2/2

The Bargaining Model of War

\*James D. Fearon. 1995. Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.

Friday, 2/4

Private information as a cause of war—Persian Gulf I

\*Janice Gross Stein. 1992. Deterrence and Compellence in the Gulf, 1990-1991: A Failed or Impossible Task? *International Security* 17(2): 147-179.

Monday, 2/7

Commitment Problems

\*Robert Powell. 2006. War as a commitment problem. *International Organization* 60(1): 169-203.

Wednesday, 2/9

Issue Indivisibilities

\*Stacie Goddard. 2006. Uncommon Ground: Indivisible Territory and the Politics of Legitimacy. *International Organization* 60: 35-68.

Friday, 2/11

The Bargaining Model and Persian Gulf II

\*David A. Lake. 2010/11. Two Cheers for Bargaining Theory: Assessing Rationalist Explanations for the Iraq War. *International Security* 35(3): 7-52.

Monday, 2/14

\*\*\*EXAM I\*\*\*

## III. The Case of World War I

Wednesday, 2/16

Laying the groundwork for July 1914—imperial rivalries and diplomatic crises

Begin Fromkin, *Europe's Last Summer*

Friday, 2/18

Reading break—no class

Continue Fromkin, *Europe's Last Summer*

Monday, 2/21

Reading break—no class

Finish Fromkin, *Europe's Last Summer*

Wednesday, 2/23

Debate over the July Crisis

Please come to class with two things. The first is a list of the ten most critical events or decisions leading up to the outbreak of World War I in July 1914. The second is a typed statement of 300-500 words that answers the following questions: *What might have a hypothetical peaceful settlement among Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, Serbia, and Russia looked like in July 1914? Why did they fail to reach it i.e. avoid war?*

Note: these assignments will constitute the equivalent of at least three days worth of points in the attendance, participation, quizzes, component of your grade.

Friday, 2/25

Causes of World War I: Offense-Defense Theory

\*Stephen Van Evera. 1984. The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War. *International Security* 9(1): 58-107

Monday, 2/28

Causes of World War I: Power Transition Theory

Review notes on Fearon 1995 and Powell 2006

Dale C. Copeland. 2000. *The Origins of Major War*, pp. 56-117.

Wednesday, 3/2

Causes of World War I: Alliances and Information

\*Scott D. Sagan. 1986. 1914 Revisited: Allies, Offense, and Instability. *International Security* 11(2): 151-175.

Friday, 3/4

Causes of World War I: Globalization and War? Imperialism and War?

\*David M. Rowe. 2005. The Tragedy of Liberalism: How Globalization Caused World War I. *Security Studies* 14(3): 407-447.

\*\*prompt for paper passed out\*\*

Monday, 3/7

Causes of World War I: Domestic Politics and War? Democratic Peace?

Bruce Russett. 1996. Why Democratic Peace? In Brown, Lynn-Jones, and Miller, eds, *Debating the Democratic Peace*, pp. 82-115. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wednesday, 3/9

Causes of World War I: Democratic Peace (ctd), Civil-Military relations

\*Jack Snyder. 1984. Civil-Military Relations and the Cult of the Offensive, 1914 and 1984. *International Security* 9(1): 108-146.

Friday, 3/11

\*\*PAPER DUE\*\*

#### **IV. National Security in the Nuclear World**

Monday, 3/21

Nuclear weapons and the changing nature of military force

Robert Powell. 1990. *Nuclear Deterrence Theory: The Search for Credibility*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-32.

Wednesday, 3/23

The Cold War I—Containment, NSC-68, and the Cold War arms race

Marc Trachtenberg. 1988/89. A Wasting Asset”: American Strategy and the Shifting Nuclear Balance, 1949-1954. *International Security* 13(3): 5-49.

Friday, 3/25

The Cold War II—credibility, allies, and the problems of extended deterrence

Monday, 3/28

Deterrence and National Missile Defense

\*Robert Powell. 2003. Nuclear Deterrence Theory, Nuclear Proliferation, and National Missile Defense. *International Security* 27(4): 86-118.



Wednesday, 3/30

Nuclear Proliferation

\*Francis J. Gavin. 2009/10. Same As It Ever Was: Nuclear Alarmism, Proliferation, and the Cold War. *International Security* 34(3): 7-37.

## **V. Failed States and Civil War**

Friday, 4/1

State failure

\*Finish Bates, *When Things Fell Apart*.

Monday, 4/4

Civil War: domestic and international causes

\*James D. Fearon. 1998. Commitment Problems and the Spread of Ethnic Conflict. In David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild, eds., *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict: Fear, Diffusion, and Escalation*, pp. 107-126. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wednesday, 4/6

The Economic Causes of Civil War

Michael L. Ross. 2008. Blood Barrels. *Foreign Affairs* 87(3): 2-9.

Paul Collier. 2007. *The Bottom Billion*. Oxford University Press, pp. 3-37.

Friday, 4/8

Ethnicity, nationalism, and civil war

\*Stuart Kaufman. 2006. Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice? Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence. *International Security* 30(4): 45-86.

Monday, 4/11

Ending civil wars

\*Chaim Kaufman. 1996. Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars. *International Security* 20(4): 136-175.

Wednesday, 4/13

Debating International Intervention

\*Alan Kuperman. 2008. The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans. *International Studies Quarterly* 52(1): 49-80.

## **VI. National Security in the Post-9/11 Era**

### **Va. Terrorism**

Friday, 4/15

Terrorism I

Hoffman, "What is Terrorism?" in in Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis, *International Politics*, 9<sup>th</sup> edition, pp. 174-180. New York: Pearson Longman.

\*Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara Walter. 2006. The Strategies of Terrorism. *International Security* 31(1): 49-79.

Monday, 4/18

Terrorism II

Gregory Gause III. 2005. Can Democracy Stop Terrorism? *Foreign Affairs* 84(5): 62-76.

### **Vb. China**

Wednesday, 4/20

Power Transition Theory and the China Threat

Avery Goldstein. 2007. Power Transitions, Institutions, and China's Rise in East Asia. *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 30(4/5): 639-682.

Friday, 4/22

China's Peaceful Rise

Zheng Bijian. 2005. China's "Peaceful Rise" to Great Power Status. *Foreign Affairs* 84(5): 18-24.

Monday, 4/25

China-Taiwan

Patrick J. McDonald. 2009. *The Invisible Hand of Peace: Capitalism, the War Machine, and International Relations Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 233-263.

### **Vc. American Grand Strategy**

Wednesday, 4/27

American grand strategy I

\*Jonathan Monten. 2005. The Roots of the Bush Doctrine: Power, Nationalism, and Democracy Promotion in U.S. Strategy. *International Security* 29(4): 112-156.

Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder. 2005/6. Prone to Violence. *The National Interest* 82: 31-38.

Friday, 4/29

American grand strategy II--The Bush Doctrine

George W. Bush. 2002. The National Security Strategy of the United States.

Francis Fukuyama. 2006. After Neoconservatism. *The New York Times Magazine*. February 19, 2006.

William Kristol and Robert Kagan. 1996. Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy. *Foreign Affairs* 75(4): 18-32.

Monday, 5/2

Collective security in the 21<sup>st</sup> century

Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay. 2007. Democracies of the World, Unite. *The American Interest* 11(3): 5-19.

Wednesday, 5/4

American grand strategy III—Empire?

\*James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 2004. Neotrusteeship and the Problem of Weak States. *International Security* 28(4): 5-43.

Friday, 5/6

The financial foundations of empire: thinking about the international legacy of 2008

Niall Ferguson. 2010. Complexity and Collapse. *Foreign Affairs* 89(2): 18-32.

\*\*take home final distributed\*\*