

<p><b>Political Science 376</b>    Fall 2022  <b>Classroom: Sage 2218</b>  <b>MWF 11:30—12:30</b>  <b>Credits: 3</b></p>	<p><b>Professor Michael Jasinski</b>  <b>Sage Hall 4624</b>  <b>Email: <a href="mailto:jasinskm@uwosh.edu">jasinskm@uwosh.edu</a></b>  <b>Office Hours: Thursdays 11-2pm. At other times by appointment.</b></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:

**Grade Scale:** Final course grades will be assigned as follows: A: 92 and higher. A-: 90-91; B+: 88-89; B: 82-87; B-: 80-81; C+: 78-79; C: 72-77; C-: 70-71; D: 60-69; F: 0-59.

--**Exams.** There will be two exams, each with 50 multiple choice questions. The exams are non-cumulative. Dates of exams are on the course schedule below. Each of the exams is worth 15% of the final course grade.

--**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.

The total number of points is 16

Each individual response is graded on a two point scale (1-2). These points will be earned as follows:

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

--Is at least 250 words in length.

The remaining points will be awarded to reflect the amount of input from that week's readings.

0-1 reading cited: 0 points.

2 readings: 2 points

3 readings: 4 points

4 or more readings: 8 points.

Each of the answers should cite one of the main readings for the week (marked with \*) AND one supplemental reading. No reading should be cited in more than two of the four answers.

The readings ought to be explicitly cited using either in-text citations, for example (Smith, 2010, p. 23) or footnotes.

I will post each week's questions on Monday of each week. The responses will be due the Friday of the following week. You will lose four (4) points for a late submission unless the lateness is for an excused reason.

Weekly responses should take the form of documents (.doc or .pdf formats) uploaded to their respective Canvas dropboxes.

I will provide written feedback on Canvas to each weekly response. Collectively, they will amount to 30% 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%.

### **Option 1: Great Power Conflict.**

Your topic should revolve around a comparative analysis of two parties involved in a conflict, either 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:

--Casus Belli: 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? If analyzing a war, was this a preventive, pre-emptive, or a power transition war fought in the context of a broader rivalry?

--Strategy: Conflicts are decided through a combination of Annihilation, Attrition, and Exhaustion. Which approach did each side take? Were they successful at pursuing that strategy? What domestic policies were enacted to support the chosen strategy?

--International Context: Which side was more successful in attracting allies? What contribution did they 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?

--Supporting your assertions and evidence with bibliography and citations.

--Use proper grammar, syntax, spelling.

Each of these categories will receive a mark of 0 (inadequate), 1 (adequate), or 2 (outstanding). A paper which scores nothing but 0s will receive a comprehensive grade of F (40%), a paper with nothing but 1s will receive a comprehensive grade of C- (70%), and a paper with nothing but 2s will receive a comprehensive grade of A (100%).

### **Option 2: Quantitative Research Design.**

Ideal for Political Science majors, especially if they completed 245. Here, your task is to come up with a possible contribution to the theories of international conflict. A proper research design will consist of the following components:

--Research puzzle: description of an empirical phenomenon existing theories do not adequately explain or predict, or conflicting theoretical explanations of said phenomenon.

--Research question: Your attempt to get at what you believe to be the core of that puzzle.  
Literature review: a survey of existing literature on the topic, in order to identify existing attempts to explain the phenomenon you identified in your research puzzle, with the aim of identifying a gap in existing research that your project will fill.

--Theory and hypotheses: What is that alternative explanation you propose that others haven't? What cause-effect relationships do you expect to exist?

--Empirics: Operationalize the concepts you introduced in the section above using available data on international conflicts in preparation for statistical analysis, which you will not perform in the context of this course. You don't need to produce a dataset, but should estimate the geographic and temporal span of your expected dataset, as well as all the variables you'll be using and what data you will obtain in order to operationalize them.

--Supporting your assertions and evidence with bibliography and citations.

--Use proper grammar, syntax, spelling.

Each of these categories will receive a mark of 0 (inadequate), 1 (adequate), or 2 (outstanding). A paper which scores nothing but 0s will receive a comprehensive grade of F (40%), a paper with nothing but 1s will receive a comprehensive grade of C- (70%), and a paper with nothing but 2s will receive a comprehensive grade of A (100%).

**Class Participation:** 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.

**Attendance:** You may have up to three unexcused absences. Any unexcused absences beyond that will cost you a point to the grade, up to 10 points.

**Office hours:** They are specified at the top of the syllabus. In addition, I am available at other times by appointment or through MS Teams. If my MS Teams icon has a green dot next to it, it means I am online and (likely) available. It is a relatively convenient way to exchange messages or even have a face-to-face (virtual) chat either during or outside office hours.

**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.

#### **Course Readings Schedule**

Each week comes with a broad range of assigned readings. Readings marked with \* represent the major theoretical and foundational readings for that week, containing the essential concepts used in the course. These concepts are the topic of class discussion. The remaining readings represent supplementary information, including historical case studies, in order to illustrate the theories and concepts in action.

**Week 1 W 9/7, F 9/9 “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 M 9/12, W 9/14, F 9/16 “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 M 9/19, W 9/21, F 9/23 “War is bad in that it begets more evil than it kills”.**

\*Doyle, “Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace”

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

\*Levy, “Domestic Politics and War”

Kant, “To Perpetual Peace”

Menegazzi, “China Reinterprets the Liberal Peace”

Druckman, “Nationalism, Patriotism, and Group Loyalty”

Williams, “The Frontier Thesis and American Foreign Policy”

Kesselman, “The Frontier Thesis and the Great Depression”

**Week 4 M 9/26, W 9/28, F 9/30 “You can do anything with bayonets except sit on them”**

\*Art, “The Four Functions of Force.”

\*Krepinevich, “Protracted Great Power War”

Behner and Collins, “Can Volunteer Forces Deter Great Power War?”

Francis, “Air Supremacy Today and Tomorrow”

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 M 10/3, W 10/5, F 10/7 “Whoever makes a pact with these means of violence—and every politician does—is exposed to its specific consequences.”**

\*Biddle and Long, “Democracy and Military Effectiveness”

- \*Reiter and Stam, "Democracy and Battlefield Military Effectiveness"
- \*Rosen, "Military Effectiveness: Why Society Matters"
- \*Grunskel and Jasinski, "Two-Level Game Operational Code"

Clausewitz, "On War," Book VIII, Chapters 3 and 6  
 Foster, "No Sugarcoating It"  
 Obinger, "Conscription, the Military, and Welfare State Development"  
 Stahel, "The Wehrmacht and National Socialist Military Thinking"  
 Schwartz, "Thinking Beyond Dead Germans"

**Week 6 M 10/10, W 10/12, F 10/14 *"Tactics without technology are useless, technology without tactics is pointless."***

- \*Krepinevich, "Cavalry to Computer"
- \*Levy, "The Offensive/Defensive Balance of Military Technology"

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 M 10/17, W 10/19, F 10/21 *"International politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power."***

- \*Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory"
- \*De Keersmaeker, "Multipolar Myths and Unipolar Fantasies"
- \*Jervis, "Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective"

Christensen and Snyder, "Multipolarity, Perceptions, and the Tragedy of 1914"  
 Monteiro, "Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful"  
 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"

**First Exam Friday, 10/21**

**Week 8 M 10/24, W 10/26, F 10/28 *"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 M 11/31, W 11/2, F 11/4 "Preventive war is like committing suicide out of fear of death"**

\*Levy, "Preventive War and Democratic Politics"

\*Kegley and Raymond, "Preventive War and Permissive Normative Order"

\*Lee, "Power Shifts and Preventive War"

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 M 11/7, W 11/9, F 11/11 "A pre-emptive action, however well justified, may come back with unwelcome consequences in the future"**

\*Stover, "Pre-Emptive War"

\*Mirza and Sajid, "The Use of Force in Self-Defence for Global Peace"

Kurtulus, "The Six-Day War Revisited"

Kumar, "Iraq War 2003"

Velez-Green, "A Doctrine of Pre-Emption"

Velez-Green, "The Unsettling View from Moscow"

Gupta, "The Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Strike"

Garwood-Gowers, "Israel's Airstrike on Syria's al-Kibar Facility"

**Week 11 M 11/14, W 11/16, F 11/18, M 11/21 "A short victorious war"**

\*Haynes, "Diversionary Conflict"

\*Jung, "Foreign Targets and Diversionary Conflict"

\*Johnson and Barnes, "Responsibility and Diversionary Use of Force"

Kanat, "Diversionary Foreign Policy in Authoritarian States"

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"

**Research paper initial draft due on Wednesday, 11/23**

**Week 12 M 11/28, W 11/30, F 12/2 "Alliance does not mean love, not anymore than war means hate"**

\*Walt, "Alliances: Balancing and Bandwagoning"

\*Kim, "Alliance Transitions and Great Power War"

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 M 12/5, W 12/7, F 12/9 "An unjust peace is better than a just war"**

\*Barnett, "Legal Constraints"  
\*Williams, "Just Post Bellum"

Taylor, "Just War Theory and the Military Response to Terrorism"  
Tobia, "The Language of War"  
Peperkamp, "Blurry Boundaries between Peace and War"

**Week 14 M 12/12, W 12/14, F 12/16 "War is Peace"**

\*Mount, "Hybrid Peace/War"  
\*Stoker and Whiteside, "Gray-Zone Conflict and Hybrid Warfare"

Rumer, "Hard Power Rules"  
Clark, "Russian Hybrid Warfare"  
Kofman, "A Comparative Guide to Russia's Use of Military Force"  
McCormack and Pascoe, "Sanctions and Preventive War"  
Megerisi, "Geostrategic Dimensions of Libya's Civil War"

**Second Exam Friday, 12/16**

**Research paper final draft due on Sunday, 12/18**