

<p><b>Political Science 376 Spring 2021</b>  Classroom: Sage 1232  Tu-Th 1:20-2:50  Credits: 3</p>	<p><b>Professor Michael Jasinski</b>  Sage Hall 4624  Email: <a href="mailto:jasinskm@uwosh.edu">jasinskm@uwosh.edu</a>  Office Hours: F 11-2pm (MS Teams)</p>
--	--

**International Conflict**

or

***"Peace is a dream of sages; war is the history of Man".***

Louis-Philippe, comte de Ségur (1753-1830)

Officier, diplomate, membre de l'Académie française

**Course Description:** A multi-disciplinary approach to study the causes and conditions of war and peace in our world. Simulations of situations of war and peace will be researched in the classroom with student participation.

**Prerequisites:** None.

**Readings:** All course readings are on Canvas. This course requires no textbooks.

This course carries the Global Scholar designation:

**Global Scholar** courses build upon the knowledge, skills and perspectives that students gain in their (required) **USP Global Citizenship** (GC) course. Together, GC and GS courses aim to provide students with the knowledge of nations, cultures or societies beyond the U.S.; the recognition of how interaction, interdependence and inequity among diverse geographical, social, political, or economic systems have shaped historical and contemporary global challenges and opportunities; and the skills needed to engage with the responsibilities of informed citizenship in a complex, interdependent and changing world.

Global Scholar Learning Outcomes

- Students will gain knowledge of the broad range of international conflict theories.
- Students will acquire knowledge of and appreciation for diverse national “ways of war” conditioned by individual countries’ geography, history, and politically relevant neighborhood, and ways by which their experience of war influences their political culture. Countries covered in detail include United States, Germany, France, Great Britain, and Russia.

## Political Science Student Learning Outcomes

### 1) Understand and apply theory frameworks

*Political Science students should be able to*

- A. recognize normative and ethical components of politics
- B. understand theoretical foundations of politics in the different subfields
- C. recognize the value of theories for making sense of the past and present
- D. apply theoretical arguments and concepts in the service of explanation or prediction of political phenomena

### 2) Understand and apply history as a lens of inquiry

*Political Science students should be able to*

- A. use history as a framework for understanding contemporary politics
- B. understand that discerning historical patterns and their disruption are critical parts of the discipline

## Assessing the Student Learning Outcomes:

--**Weekly Responses.** Starting with week 2, there will be a set of response questions posted to Canvas.

The requirement here is to write 250-word responses for **four** of the discussion questions **for each week**. Submit them to the relevant dropbox under Assignments on Canvas.

Each response is graded on a four-point scale (1-4). These points will be earned as follows:

--Actually provides a sound, logical, evidence-supported answer to the question.

--Introduces relevant information obtained for one of the readings, including readings for that week or other weeks. No reading may be cited more than in two responses per week. As an alternative, you may cite outside sources that you have located through your own research.

--Is at least 250 words in length

--The fourth point can be learned by EITHER citing a second article, OR providing a description and discussion of an empirical, real-world example to illustrate your answer.

Weekly responses should take the form of documents (.doc or .pdf formats) uploaded to their respective Canvas dropboxes, are due by the beginning of the following week (i.e., week 2 responses are due on Monday of Week 3, and so on throughout the semester), however, I will not assess any lateness penalties.

I will provide written feedback on Canvas to each of your answers. Collectively, they will amount to 60% of the final course grade.

**Research Paper:** This project will count for 30% of your course grade, with the initial submission (specified in the course schedule below) counting for 5%, and the final submission due at the end of the

semester worth the remaining 25%. **The first draft of the paper** (5% of the total course grade) is due on **Friday, March 26**, and the final draft (25% of the course grade) is due at the end of the semester.

**Option 1: Peer Power Conflict.** Your topic should revolve around a comparative analysis of two parties involved in a conflict, be it a militarized interstate dispute, a war, or a militarized rivalry. The countries being analyzed ought to be on opposing sides of the conflict and, if the conflict involves many actors, should be among the most important actors involved on whose actions the ultimate outcome actually depended. Your analysis should consist of the following:

--Motivation: what prompted the conflict? What are the aims, domestic or international, of both countries that the two adversaries (and particularly the initiator) are trying to accomplish through war? Is there evidence of diversionary incentives? Why are non-violent options rejected? If a target, why does the target country opt to decide to resist using military force?

--International Context: What are the balance and distribution of power? Are there elements of power transition or prevention evident in the decisions to initiate the conflict? What allies can either power count on in the confrontation, and what is their contribution?

--The Means of Violence: what is the relative power and quality of the armed forces of the adversaries? How effective are they at the task of deterrence, defense, and compellence? What domestic policies were enacted to build up that military? What contributions do the allies make?

--Endgame: Which of the two emerged as the more successful of the two in the confrontation? To which of the above factors can the success be attributed? What factor(s) were responsible for the "losing" side's failure? What could/should it have done to avert that outcome?

**Option 2: Minor Power at War.** Here, you are looking at a single country that initiates a conflict, is targeted by another minor or major power, or decides to join a conflict that involves countries significantly more powerful than itself. Your analysis should consist of the following:

--Motivation: What aims is the country hoping to achieve, domestic and international, by initiating or joining in the conflict? If a target, why does it opt to resist a superior power through military force rather than seeking appeasement? Is there evidence of prevention, power transition relative to a regional minor power rival, or diversion?

--International Context: what major power allies can the minor power count on by joining the conflict? What major power adversaries does it risk provoking? Why does the risk seem justified?

--The Means of Violence: what is the relative power and quality of minor power engaged? How effective are they at the task of deterrence, defense, and compellence? What domestic policies were enacted to build up that military?

--Endgame: Were the political aims outlined in Motivation achieved? What factors were responsible for success or failure of the resort to military action?

### **Research Paper Grading Criteria:**

Each paper will be evaluated according to the following:

- Introduction that establishes what the topic of your paper is, and its importance to understanding international conflict.
- A clear hypothesis which explains the argument you are making in the paper.
- Extensive empirical evidence backing up your hypothesis.
- Supporting your assertions and evidence with bibliography and citations.
- Proper grammar, syntax, spelling.

Each of these categories will receive a mark of 1 (inadequate), 2 (adequate), or 3 (outstanding). A paper which scores nothing but 1s will receive a comprehensive grade of F (40%), a paper with nothing but 2s will receive a comprehensive grade of C- (70%), and a paper with nothing but 3s will receive a comprehensive grade of A (100%).

**Class Participation:** While attendance is not required, class participation will be worth 10% of the final course grade. This is by far the most subjective component of the grade, however, you will get the full credit for it if you make your presence felt in class on at least a semi-regular basis, in the form of answering questions, asking questions, providing commentary relevant to the current topic. You may do that by speaking or (even better, given the class format) using the chat function in Collaborate Ultra.

**Office hours - Office Hours (MS Teams):** The Political Science Department uses Microsoft Teams (MS Teams) for holding office hours. This system is available to all UWO students. Faculty will be available during the hours noted on your syllabus. When logging into MS Teams, look closely at the status symbols for your instructor. A green dot by the professor's icon (which may be their picture or their initials) means they are available. A red dot means they are busy.

Generally, you are able to join office hour meetings and talk openly in the forum or use the chat function freely. At times, your instructor may be in a private meeting with a student during office hours, and will mark my availability as "busy" (a red dot).

We hope that using MS Teams for office hours for all of our courses will help students become more accustomed to virtual office hours during the pandemic. The main point to remember is that we are available to you. Please use our office hours freely and often. We are here to help. Many faculty are also happy to set up meetings outside of my office hours if students have conflicts with the posted times.

**Expectations for Academic Honesty:** A college education is intended to develop your skills, knowledge, and confidence. Graded assignments are designed to work on these items. Thus, to gain the skills, knowledge, and confidence of a college-educated person all graded work is to be your own. When you are directed to work alone, an assignment or test must be done by you, its primary ideas are to be your own, and any outside materials should be dealt with properly (quoted when using someone's words, and cited when quoting or referencing them in any other way). When your teacher directs you to work in teams, the work is to be done by the team. More information can be found here:

<https://uwosh.edu/politicalscience/wp-content/uploads/sites/14/2020/08/Academic-Honesty.pdf>

**Note:** If substantive changes are made in course syllabus, such as changes in schedule or assignments, notification will be provided in a timely manner and a revised syllabus made available.

**Disclosure statement:** “Students are advised to see the following URL for disclosures about essential consumer protection items required by the Students Right to Know Act of 1990:  
[https://uwosh.edu/financialaid/consumer-information/.](https://uwosh.edu/financialaid/consumer-information/)”

**Statement of reasonable accommodation for student with disabilities**

<https://www.uwosh.edu/deanofstudents/Accessibility-Center/faculty-and-staff-resources/syllabus-statement>

**Grievance Procedure:** The Department of Political Science is committed to offering you a high-quality classroom experience, and we take your feedback very seriously. If you have concerns about anything related to this course, assignments, or teaching method, you are encouraged to first speak with your instructor directly. If you are not comfortable speaking with the instructor, you are invited to speak with the Chair of the Department of Political Science, Dr. James Krueger. He can be reached at [kruegerj@uwosh.edu](mailto:kruegerj@uwosh.edu). Should he be unable to resolve your concerns, he will guide you to appropriate resources within the College of Letters and Science.

**Note to Political Science Majors:** Political Science majors should take Political Methodology (245) in either their sophomore year or the first semester of their junior year. Political Science 245 is a prerequisite for the senior capstone, Political analysis (401), and cannot be taken concurrently. If you are currently a political science major or if you think you will be one of our majors in the future, it is important that you save your graded coursework from this class. If you have questions, please see me or any faculty member after class.

**Week 1: “War, what is it good for?”**

Schu, What is War?

Shotwell, “What is war as an ‘instrument of national policy’?”

Dreyer, “Unifying conceptualizations of interstate rivalry”

Gochman and Maoz, “Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1984”

**Week 2: “One commands, all others obey.”**

Walker, “Motivational Foundations of Political Belief Systems: A Reanalysis of the Operational Code Construct”

Nye, “Types and Skills”

Shearer, “Stalin at War”

Gompert et al., “Hitler’s Decision to Invade USSR”

Kotkin, “When Stalin Faced Hitler”

Tyler, “Operational Intelligence and the Commander”

**Week 3: “War is bad in that it begets more evil than it kills”.**

Levy, “Domestic Politics and War”

Doyle, “Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace”

Kant, “To Perpetual Peace”

Jervis, “Leading Power Peace”

Menegazzi, “China Reinterprets the Liberal Peace”

Holsti, “War, Peace, and the State of the State”

Druckman, “Nationalism, Patriotism, and Group Loyalty”

Williams, "The Frontier Thesis and American Foreign Policy"  
Kesselman, "The Frontier Thesis and the Great Depression"

**Week 4: "You can do anything with bayonets except sit on them"**

Art, "The Four Functions of Force."  
Beehner and Collins, "Can Volunteer Forces Deter Great Power War?"  
Francis, "Air Supremacy Today and Tomorrow"  
Krepinevich, "Protracted Great Power War"  
Hendrix and Armstrong, "Naval Presence and National Strategy"  
Rowlands, "Decided Preponderance at Sea"  
Douhet, "Command of the Air"  
Haun and Jackson, "Breaker of Armies"  
Pandolfe, "The Evolution of US Naval Strategy"  
Francis, "Air Supremacy in Airpower Theory"  
Dolman, "Victory through Space Power"

**Week 5: "Whoever makes a pact with these means of violence—and every politician does—is exposed to its specific consequences."**

Clausewitz, "On War," Book VIII, Chapters 3 and 6  
Biddle and Long, "Democracy and Military Effectiveness"  
Reiter and Stam, "Democracy and Battlefield Military Effectiveness"  
Rosen, "Military Effectiveness: Why Society Matters"  
Roberts, "German and Soviet Military Doctrinal Innovation Before World War 2"  
Kai, "People's War"  
Obinger, "Conscription, the Military, and Welfare State Development"  
Stahel, "The Wehrmacht and National Socialist Military Thinking"

**Week 6: "Tactics without technology are useless, technology without tactics is pointless."**

Levy, "The Offensive/Defensive Balance of Military Technology"  
Krepinevich, "Cavalry to Computer"  
Liaropoulos, "Revolutions in Warfare"  
Krepinevich, "What Has Changed?"  
Pollack, "Society, Technology, and Future Warfare"  
Hamourtziadou and Jackson, "Winning Wars: The Triumphs and Myths of Technology"  
Adamsky, "An American Revolution in Military Affairs"

**Week 7: "International politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power."**

Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory"  
Christensen and Snyder, "Multipolarity, Perceptions, and the Tragedy of 1914"  
De Keersmaecker, "Multipolar Myths and Unipolar Fantasies"  
Monteiro, "Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful"  
Jervis, "Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective"  
Wilkinson, "Unipolarity without Hegemony"  
Layne, "This Time It's Real"  
Mazarr, "The Essence of Strategic Competition with China"  
Wu, "Recognizing and Resisting China's Sharp Power"

Pan, "Rethinking Chinese Power"

**Week 8: "Speak softly and carry a big stick"**

DiCicco and Levy, "Power Shifts and Problem Shifts"  
Kim, "Power Transitions and Great Power War from Westphalia to Waterloo"  
Luban Lai, "Power Transition Theory"  
Rauch, "Adjusting Power Transition Theory"  
Lemke, "Power Transition Theory and the End of the Cold War"  
Rauch and Wurm, "Making the World Safe for Power Transition"  
Yang, "Power Transition, Balance of Power, and the Rise of China"  
Zhu, "Power Transitions and US-China Relations"  
Jalil, "China's Rise"  
Yesilada and Tanrikulu, "Regional Power Transition and the Future of Turkey"  
Ahmed, "Pentagon study declares American empire is collapsing"

**Week 9: "Preventive war is like committing suicide out of fear of death"**

Kegley and Raymond, "Preventive War and Permissive Normative Order"  
Lee, "Power Shifts and Preventive War"  
Levy, "Preventive War and Democratic Politics"  
Sternan, "Fueling Endless War"  
Prebeck, "Past Cases of Preventive War"  
Snyder, "Better Now Than Later"  
Record, "Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation"  
Cirincione, "Can Preventive War Cure Proliferation?"

**Week 10: "A pre-emptive action, however well justified, may come back with unwelcome consequences in the future"**

Stover, "Pre-Emptive War"  
Kurtulus, "The Six-Day War Revisited"  
Kumar, "Iraq War 2003"  
Velez-Green, "A Doctrine of Pre-Emption"  
Velez-Green, "The Unsettling View from Moscow"  
Mirza and Sajid, "The Use of Force in Self-Defence for Global Peace"  
Gupta, "The Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Strike"  
Garwood-Gowers, "Israel's Airstrike on Syria's al-Kibar Facility"

**Week 11: "A short victorious war"**

Kanat, "Diversionary Foreign Policy in Authoritarian States"  
Haynes, "Diversionary Conflict"  
Jung, "Foreign Targets and Diversionary Conflict"  
Johnson and Barnes, "Responsibility and Diversionary Use of Force"  
Kagotani et al., "Democracy and Diversionary Incentives in Japan-South Korea Disputes"  
Tir and Jasinski, "Domestic-Level Diversionary Theory of War"  
Weisiger, "Limits on Leaders"

**Week 12: "Alliance does not mean love, not anymore than war means hate"**

Kim, "Alliance Transitions and Great Power War"  
Walt, "Alliances: Balancing and Bandwagoning"

Vasquez and Rundlett, "Alliances as a Necessary Condition for Multi-Party War"  
Johnson, "Alliance Treaty Obligations and War Intervention"  
Kenwick, "Do Alliances Really Deter?"  
Benson, "Unpacking Alliances"  
Gibler and Vasquez, "Uncovering Dangerous Alliances"  
Kang, "Capability Revisited"  
Beckley, "The Myth of Entangling Alliances"

**Week 13: "An unjust peace is better than a just war"**

Taylor, "Just War Theory and the Military Response to Terrorism"  
Barnett, "Legal Constraints"  
Tobia, "The Language of War"  
Peperkamp, "Blurry Boundaries between Peace and War"  
Williams, "Just Post Bellum"

**Week 14: "War is Peace"**

Mount, "Hybrid Peace/War"  
Rumer, "Hard Power Rules"  
Clark, "Russian Hybrid Warfare"  
Kofman, "A Comparative Guide to Russia's Use of Military Force"  
Stoker and Whiteside, "Gray-Zone Conflict and Hybrid Warfare"  
McCormack and Pascoe, "Sanctions and Preventive War"  
Megerisi, "Geostrategic Dimensions of Libya's Civil War"