

Yale University
Jackson Institute for Global Affairs

APPROACHES TO INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Global Affairs 275

Fall 2017

Syllabus

Version date: September 5, 2017

Professor Nuno P. Monteiro

www.nunomonteiro.org

nuno.monteiro@yale.edu

Lectures: Mon. & Wed. 2:30-3:20PM, WTS A51, 60 Sachem St. ;
Discussion Sections: Wed. 1:30-2:20PM, WTS A35, 60 Sachem St. ;
Wed. 3:30-4:20PM, WTS A46, 60 Sachem St. ;
Wed. 4:30-5:20PM, WTS A35, 60 Sachem St. ;
Office Hours: Tue. 3:30-5:00PM, Horchow Hall #207, 55 Hillhouse Ave. ;
Book here: <https://calendly.com/npmonteiro/office-hours-10-minute-slot/>

COURSE OVERVIEW

This course introduces students to major approaches and central topics in the field of international security. The course will focus primarily on the principal man-made threats to human security: the use of violence among and within states, both by state and non-state actors. While the course will be of great relevance to understanding contemporary global affairs, it will not focus directly on the analysis of current events or the policymaking process. Instead, the course will emphasize the concepts, theories, and methods that undergird the analysis of international security affairs. Specifically, the course will cover systemic, choice-theoretic, and behavioral approaches to the study of security, and it will include materials that use both quantitative and qualitatively/historical methods with the aim of deepening our understanding of international security problems. By studying not only the substance of international security debates but also how scholars have tried to draw correct causal inferences on these topics in the face of complex realities and of limited available data, the course also has an important research design component.

COURSE FORMAT

The course will consist of two weekly 50-minute lectures plus one weekly 50-minute discussion section with the instructor. The class will be split into three groups for the discussion sections.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

This course has three requirements.

Participation: First, all students are expected to participate actively in the discussion sections by offering well-informed commentary on the weekly readings. Students should do all the readings for each week in advance of the respective discussion section and come prepared to contribute to class discussion during the sections by

bringing questions that stem from the readings. As should be obvious, participation does not mean just attendance, so please be an active participant in the section discussion, while noting that (at least on what concerns class interventions) unlike Stalin, I do not think that quantity has a quality of its own. Participation will be worth 20% of the final grade. In the absence of documented exceptional circumstances, missing more than one discussion section will result in the loss of a full letter grade in this component of the course.

Response papers: Second, each student will post a 4-page (double-spaced, 12-point font, 1-inch margins) reaction to the readings for three different weeks. These response papers should be sent in by 8:00pm the Monday before the discussion section in which we will discuss these readings. Response papers received after these deadlines but before the relevant discussion section begins will be dropped one full letter grade. Response papers will not be accepted after the relevant section starts. Each of the three short papers will be worth 15% of the final course grade. These short statements should feature a critical analysis of arguments made by the authors for the relevant week. (You should *not* summarize the readings; assume that everybody else has done the reading as well and understands the basic arguments.) You do not have to discuss all of the readings assigned for the session; you may discuss just one or two pieces, or you can pick a broader range and compare them to each other (or to readings for earlier sessions). Likewise, within each reading you select to engage, you do not have to discuss the whole piece. You may do so, but you may equally well focus on a section, a paragraph, or even a sentence that piqued your interest. You are welcome to choose any three weeks in which to write your reaction papers, though one of these papers must be submitted by the end of week four (September 27), and another before the end of week eight (November 01).

Final paper: Third, students will write a 12-15 page final paper that identifies a particular theoretical or empirical puzzle in international security and then develops an argument to account for it and marshals evidence in its support. Students should plan to read some material beyond the syllabus, but the paper is not expected to be exhaustively researched. Instead, the paper will be assessed on the strength, clarity, and originality of the argument, the quality of evidence cited, as well as the adequacy of the research design. (Discussing six to ten fairly recent article-length pieces representing the theoretical and empirical “state of the art” in the academic and policy study of the topic at hand is perfectly adequate.) Students are advised to discuss their topics with the Teaching Fellows before beginning to write; you are also advised to begin early. Fair warning: this is not the kind of paper that you can write in one or two days. The paper is due on the last day of reading week, December 13, by 5:00PM. This paper will be worth 35% of the final grade.

To reiterate, final grades will be assigned as follows:

- Participation in discussions: 20%;
- Three response papers: $3 \times 15\% = 45\%$;
- Final paper: 35%.

Note: In order to receive an overall passing grade, students must receive a passing grade in all three components of the final grade. In other words, failing one component of the course will lead to a failing grade in the overall course.

COURSE POLICIES

Plagiarism: Please note the following:

- You need to cite all sources used for papers, including drafts of papers, and repeat the reference each time you use the source in your written work;
- You need to place quotation marks around any cited or cut-and-pasted materials, in addition to footnoting or otherwise marking the source;
- If you do not quote directly – that is, if you paraphrase – you still need to mark your source each time you use borrowed material; otherwise you have plagiarized;
- It is also advisable that you list all sources consulted for the draft or paper in the closing materials, such as a bibliography or roster of sources consulted;
- You may not submit the same paper, or substantially the same paper, in more than one course;
- If topics for two courses coincide, you need written permission from both instructors before either combining work on two papers or revising an earlier paper for submission to a new course.

It is the policy of Yale College that all cases of academic dishonesty be reported to the chair of the Executive Committee. Please make sure to consult the relevant section of the Yale College regulations available [here](#).

It is a good idea to take the time to learn a standard citation style, such as the Modern Language Association (MLA) or the Chicago Manual of Style.

Electronic Devices: The use of any electronic devices, including laptop computers, tablets, and phones is not allowed during lectures or discussion sections. *All cell phones must be turned off*. Please use pen and paper to take notes. I do this in your own interest, as an emerging consensus in the scientific literature shows that the use of electronic devices hinders students' understanding of complex conceptual issues. On this topic, see:

- Pam A. Mueller & Daniel M. Oppenheimer, "The Pen is Mightier than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand over Laptop Note Taking," *Psychological Science* 25.6 (2014), pp. 1159-1168;
- Darren Rosenblum, "Leave Your Laptops at the Door to My Classroom," *The New York Times*, January 2, 2017;
- Cindy May, "Students are Better Off without a Laptop in the Classroom," *Scientific American*, July 11, 2017.

Deadlines: While all deadlines will be strictly enforced, I know that emergencies and illnesses might arise during the term. If that happens, please let me know as early as possible so that we can work out alternative arrangements for you to complete your work within a reasonable period of time. In emergency cases, you will need to present a "dean's excuse" in order to be allowed to turn in late work or justify a series of absences from class sessions.

READINGS

The selected texts were chosen to represent the major scholarly positions on each topic. They provide a wide range of views and differ in both their persuasiveness and the evidence they provide. As a whole, the selection is designed to encourage critical evaluation of existing academic literature. In order to best achieve this goal, keep in mind the following questions when doing the readings: What is the argument the author is trying to make? Why does it matter? What are its strengths and weaknesses? How convincing is it? What are possible counter-arguments? Above all, how does the argument advance our understanding of international security?

All readings are available in PDF format on the course website on the Canvas server, under the “Files” tab in folders created for each session. Below, the readings for each session are listed in the order you should do them.

COURSE SCHEDULE

PART I – APPROACHES, THEORIES, AND SECURITY

Session 01: What Is (International) Security?

Wednesday, August 30

- John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), pp. 11-71;
- Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, expanded edition (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007[1932]), pp. 19-79.

Session 02: Approaches to the Study of International Security

Wednesday, September 06

- John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, “Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing is Bad for International Relations,” *European Journal of International Relations* 19.3 (2013): 427-457;
- Cyrus Samii, “Causal Empiricism in Quantitative Research,” *Journal of Politics* 78.3 (2016): 941-955;
- Nuno P. Monteiro, “We Can Never Study Merely One Thing: Reflections on System Thinking and IR,” *Critical Review* 24.3 (2012): 343-366.

Session 03: Strategic Interaction and Levels of Analysis in International Security

Monday, September 11

- J. David Singer, “The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations,” *World Politics* 14.1 (1961): 77-92;
- Robert D. Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games,” *International Organization* 42.3 (1988): 427-460;
- David A. Lake and Robert Powell, “International Relations: A Strategic-Choice Approach,” in Lake and Powell, editors, *Strategic Choice and International Relations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), chapter 1.

Session 04: International Theory and Security

Wednesday, September 13

- John J. Mearsheimer, “Structural Realism,” in Dunne, Kurki, and Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 71-88;

- Michael W. Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics," *American Political Science Review* 80.4 (1986): 1151-1169;
- Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46.2 (1992): 391-425.

Session 05: Conflict, Cooperation, and the Security Dilemma

Monday, September 18

- Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 30.2 (1978):167-214;
- Charles Glaser, "The Security Dilemma Revisited," *World Politics*, 50.1 (1997): 171-201.

PART II – INTERSTATE POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Session 06: The Logic of Political Violence

Wednesday, September 20

- Carl von Clausewitz, *On War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret, books I and VIII.

Session 07: The Causes of Interstate Wars

Monday, September 25

- James D. Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War," *International Organization* 49.3 (1995): 379-414;
- Alexandre Debs and Nuno P. Monteiro, "Known unknowns: Power shifts, uncertainty, and war," *International Organization* 68.1 (2014): 1-31;
- Jack S. Levy, "The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace," *Annual Review of Political Science* 1 (1998): 139-165.

Session 08: Alliances, Strategy, and the Causes of World War I

Wednesday, September 27

- Norman Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy: 1814-1914* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992), pp. 408-445;
- Scott Sagan, "1914 Revisited: Allies, Offense, and Instability," *International Security* 11.2 (1986): 151-175;
- Marc Trachtenberg, "The Meaning of Mobilization in 1914," *International Security* 15.3 (1990/91): 120-150.

Session 09: Attrition, Breakthroughs, and the Conduct of World War I

Monday, October 02

- Stephen Biddle, *Military Power: Explaining Victory and Defeat in Modern Battle* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), chapter 5;
- Jeffrey A. Friedman, “Trial and Error in Strategic Assessment: How Cumulative Dynamics Affect Learning in War,” Dartmouth College working paper, 2013.

Session 10: Revisionism, Appeasement, and the Causes of World War II

Wednesday, October 04

- Alexandre Debs and Nuno P. Monteiro “An Economic Theory of War,” Yale University working paper, 2017;
- John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 2nd edition (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 2014[2001]), pp. 155-224, 267-272, and 305-322;
- Scott D. Sagan, “The Origins of the Pacific War,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18.4 (1988), pp. 893-922.

Session 11: Clever Strategies, Latent Power, and the Conduct of World War II

Monday, October 09

- Bruce M. Russett, *No Clear and Present Danger: A Skeptical View of the United States Entry into WWII* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1971), chapters 2-3.

Session 12: Coercion and Air Power

Wednesday, October 11

- Robert A. Pape, *Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996), chapters 2-3;
- Robert A. Pape, “Why Japan Surrendered,” *International Security* 18.2 (1993): 154-201.

PART III – THE POSTWAR TRANSFORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Session 13: The Nuclear Revolution

Monday, October 16

- Robert Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution: Statecraft and the Prospect of Armageddon* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), chapters 1-3;
- Scott Sagan and Kenneth Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate*, 3rd edition (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 2012[1995]), chapters 1-2.

Session 14: Nuclear Weapons and the Diplomacy of Violence

Monday, October 23

- Thomas Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966), chapters 1-3.

Session 15: Nuclear Proliferation

Wednesday, October 25

- Nuno P. Monteiro and Alexandre Debs, “The Strategic Logic of Nuclear Proliferation,” *International Security* 39.2 (2014): pp. 7-51;
- Alexandre Debs and Nuno P. Monteiro, “Conflict and Cooperation on Nuclear Nonproliferation,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20 (2017): 331-349;
- Kenneth N. Waltz, “Why Iran Should Get the Bomb: Nuclear Balancing Would Mean Stability,” *Foreign Affairs* 91.4 (2012): 2-5.

Session 16: The Democratic Peace

Monday, October 30

- Bruce Russett and John Oneal, “The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992,” *World Politics* 52.1 (1999): 1-37;
- Michael R. Tomz and Jessica LP Weeks, “Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace,” *American Political Science Review* 107.4 (2013): 849-865.
- Kevin Narizny, “Anglo-American Primacy and the Global Spread of Democracy: An International Genealogy,” *World Politics* 64.2 (2012): 341-373.

PART IV – INTRASTATE POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Session 17: Nationalism and Occupation

Wednesday, November 01

- David M. Edelstein, “Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail,” *International Security* 29.1 (2004): 49-91;
- Jeremy Ferwerda and Nicholas L. Miller, “Political Devolution and Resistance to Foreign Rule: A Natural Experiment,” *American Political Science Review* 108.3 (2014): 642-660;
- Matthew A. Kocher and Nuno P. Monteiro, “Lines of Demarcation: Causation, Design-based inference, and Historical Research,” *Perspectives on Politics* 14(4), 2016: 952-975.

Session 18: The Causes of Civil Wars

Monday, November 06

- James Fearon and David Laitin, “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War,” *American Political Science Review* 97.1 (2003): 75-90;
- Carles Boix, “Economic Roots of Civil Wars and Revolutions in the Contemporary World,” *World Politics* 60.3 (2008): 390-437;
- Lars-Erik Cederman, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min, “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel? New Data and Analysis,” *World Politics* 62.1 (2010): 87-119.

Session 19: Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Intervention

Wednesday, November 08

- Lisa Hultman, Jacob Kathman, and Megan Shannon, “United Nations Peacekeeping and Civil Protection in Civil War,” *American Journal of Political Science* 57.4 (2013): 875–891;
- Matthew A. Kocher, “The Effect of Peacekeeping Operations on Violence against Civilians in Africa: A Critical Re-analysis,” Yale University working paper, 2016;
- Alan J. Kuperman, “The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans,” *International Studies Quarterly* 52.1 (2008): 49-80;
- Jon Western and Joshua Goldstein, “Humanitarian Intervention Comes of Age: Lessons from Somalia to Libya,” *Foreign Affairs* 90.6 (2011): 48-59.

Session 20: Insurgency and Counterinsurgency

Monday, November 13

- Stathis N. Kalyvas, and Laia Balcells, “International System and Technologies of Rebellion: How the End of the Cold War Shaped Internal Conflict,” *American Political Science Review* 104.3 (2010): 415-429;
- Stathis N. Kalyvas and Matthew A. Kocher, “How ‘Free’ is Free Riding in Civil Wars? Violence, Insurgency and the Collective Action Problem,” *World Politics* 59.2 (2007): 177-216;
- Jason Lyall and Isaiah Wilson III, “Rage against the Machines: Explaining Outcomes in Counterinsurgency Wars,” *International Organization* 63.1 (2009): 67-106.

Session 21: Terrorism

Wednesday, November 15

- Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara Walter, “The Strategies of Terrorism,” *International Security* 31.1 (2006): 49-80;
- Erica Chenoweth, “Terrorism and Democracy,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16 (2013): 355-375;

- Virginia Page Fortna, “Do Terrorists Win? Rebels’ Use of Terrorism and Civil War Outcomes,” *International Organization* 69.3 (2015): 519-556.

PART V – THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Session 22: U.S. Grand Strategy in the Post-Cold War

Monday, November 27

- Barry Posen, “Command of the Commons,” *International Security* 28.1 (2003): 5-46;
- Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, “Don’t Come Home, America: The Case against Retrenchment,” *International Security* 37.3 (2012/13): 7-51;
- Barry Posen, “Pull Back: The Case for a Less Activist Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs* 92.1 (2013): 116-128.

Session 23: The Future of U.S.-China Relations

Monday, November 29

- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), chapters 4-5;
- John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 2nd edition (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 2014), chapter 10.

Session 24: Changing Norms and International Security

Monday, December 04

- Steven Pinker, *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined* (New York: Penguin, 2011), chapters 4 and 5;
- Mark W. Zacher, “The Territorial Integrity Norm: International boundaries and the Use of Force,” *International Organization* 55.2 (2001): 215-250;
- Nina Tannenwald, “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use,” *International Security* 53.3 (1999): 433-468.

Session 25: Securitization and Human Security

Wednesday, December 06

- Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998), chapter 2;
- Roland Paris, “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?” *International Security* 26.2 (2001): 87-102;

- Henry Nau, “Scholarship and Policy-Making: Who Speaks Truth to Whom?” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp, 635-647;
- Robert Cox, “The Point Is Not Just to Explain the World but to Change It,” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 84-93.