

**Yale University**  
**Department of Political Science**

Syllabus  
**U.S. STRATEGY AFTER THE COLD WAR**  
(Seminar)

Political Science S157  
Summer 2010

M-W-F 9:00-11:15am  
XXX

Faculty:  
Nuno P. Monteiro  
nuno.monteiro@yale.edu

Teaching Fellow:  
Madhavi Devasher  
madhavi.devasher@yale.edu

Office hours:  
Rosenkranz #226, Tu 9:00-11:00

Office hours:  
Rosenkranz 2<sup>nd</sup> fl., Th 11:00-1:00

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States has enjoyed a preponderance of power in the international system. With 30% of the world's GDP; a military one order of magnitude greater than any other; a defense budget close to half of global defense expenditures; a blue-water navy superior to all others combined; a chance at nuclear superiority over its erstwhile foe, Russia; and a defense R&D budget that is almost twice the total defense expenditures of its most obvious future competitor, China; the United States has unprecedented relative power. Although several other states would likely be able to avoid defeat in case of a U.S. attack, none comes anywhere near its surplus of usable, globally-deployable power. The United States thus has incomparable freedom projecting its power around the world. It has no peer competitors, and none are likely to emerge in the near future.

How should the United States behave in such circumstances? What should U.S. grand strategy be? What, if any, are the constraints on American power? What are the challenges to American power? Are peer competitors rising? The purpose of this course is to address each of these important questions, encouraging students to form their own views on contemporary international politics and U.S. grand strategy. Readings encompass the theoretical and historical aspects of the post-Cold War world, including U.S. grand strategy and foreign policy, the evolution of macro power trends, the history of armed conflicts since the end of the Cold War, etc.

**REQUIREMENTS, GRADING, AND DEADLINES**

Basic knowledge of IR theory is helpful, but not required.

The course will consist in a series of seminar sessions with pre-assigned readings. Students are expected to do all the readings prior to each session, as well as attend and participate in all sessions. The weekly sessions will focus on (i) laying out the main arguments of the assigned readings and (ii) critically

discussing them. I will open up the session with a short (20-minute maximum) lecture on the topic, laying out the main arguments in the readings, to be followed by a general examination and discussion of the core ideas.

Final grades will be assigned as follows:

- Seminar participation: 25%;
- Response papers: 25%;
- Final paper: 50%.

Each student will post a 2-3 paragraph (max. 1 page) reaction to the readings for five different sessions. Your response papers should be posted online in the Classes\*V2 server the evening before the class meeting in which we will deal with these readings, by 7:00PM. Short papers received after the deadline but before the relevant seminar session begins will be dropped one letter grade. Short papers will not be accepted after the relevant seminar session starts.

The final paper should be emailed to me at [nuno.monteiro@yale.edu](mailto:nuno.monteiro@yale.edu) at the beginning of the final session of the course -- by 9:00am on Friday, August 6. This deadline is strict. Final papers received late will be dropped one letter grade for each 24 hours past the deadline. To receive an overall passing grade, students must receive a passing grade in all three components of the final grade.

While these policies will be strictly enforced, I know that emergencies and illnesses might arise during the term. If that happens to be the case, please let me know as soon 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 excused from late work or a series of absences from class sessions.

All assignments are non-collaborative and should be entirely your own work. Ideas drawn from other sources should be properly cited. Plagiarism is unacceptable and will result in penalties up to and including a failing grade for the assignment (and therefore the course) and referral to the university for disciplinary action. If you haven't done so yet, please familiarize yourself with the University's policy on academic honesty, including cheating, plagiarism, and document citation, which can be found at <http://www.yale.edu/yalecollege/publications/uregs/appendix/cheating.html>. It is your responsibility to understand and abide by this policy. If you don't, please ask.

## **DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENTS**

**Participation:** Since the course will be conducted in a seminar format, students will take responsibility for leading much of the discussion. All students should be prepared to contribute to class discussion by informally bringing questions that stem from the readings.

**Response Papers:** These short statements should include an analysis of strengths or weaknesses of arguments made by the authors for the relevant week; questions with which you were left by the readings; or points of confusion that should be clarified. (You should *not* summarize the readings; assume that everybody else has done the reading as well.) You do not have to discuss all of the readings assigned for the week; you can discuss just one or two, or you can pick a broader range and compare them to each other (or to readings for earlier weeks). You are welcome to choose any five weeks in which to write reaction papers, though spacing things out over the semester might be best.

Final Paper: Students will write a substantial (15-page) research paper. I will distribute a list of topics at the beginning of the Monday seminar session on week 3. You should pick one topic, discuss the strengths and weakness of existing theories relating to it, and proposing a way to study the question further. If you don't like any of the topics on the list, contact me with a topic suggestion. Final papers should be printed in letter-sized paper, double-spaced, with 1-inch margins all around, using a size 12 standard font such as Arial, Calibri, or Times New Roman.

## READINGS

The selected texts were chosen to represent the major positions and theories in the study of international relations. They provide a wide range of views and differ both in the persuasiveness of the theoretical argument and the evidence provided in its support. 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 politics?

The following two books are available for purchase at the XXX bookstore:

- Robert J. Art, *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003), chapters 1-3;
- Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, *World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

All other readings are available in PDF format on the Classes\*V2 server.

The readings for each session below are listed in the order you should do them.

## COURSE OUTLINE

### PART I: UNIPOLARITY, THEORY, AND STRATEGY

#### Monday, July 5 / Week 1(1) -- Is The World Unipolar? The Basis of American Preponderance

- Kenneth Waltz, "The Emerging Structure of International Politics," *International Security*, Vol. 18 (1993): 44-79;
- Barry Posen, "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony," *International Security* Vol. 28, No. 1 (2003): 5-46;
- Richard K. Betts, "The Political Support System for American Primacy," *International Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 1 (2005): 1-14.

### **Wednesday, July 7 / Week 1(2) -- Is Unipolarity Durable? Yes!**

- William C. Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World," *International Security* Vol. 24, No. 1 (1999): 5-41;
- G. John Ikenberry, "Democracy, Institutions, and American Restraint," in Ikenberry (ed.), *America Unrivalled*, pp. 213-238;
- Thomas Risse, "U.S. Power in a Liberal Security Community," in Ikenberry (ed.), *America Unrivalled*, pp. 260-283;
- William C. Wohlforth, "Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War," *World Politics*, Vol. 61 (2008): 28-57.

### **Friday, July 9 / Week 1(3) -- Is Unipolarity Durable? No!**

- Michael Mastanduno, "Preserving the Unipolar Moment: Realist Theories and U.S. Grand Strategy after the Cold War," *International Security* Vol. 21, No. 4 (1997): 49-88;
- Kenneth N. Waltz, "Structural Realism after the Cold War," *International Security* Vol. 25, No. 1 (2000): 5-41;
- Robert Jervis, "Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective," *World Politics*, Vol. 61 (2008): 188-213.

### **Monday, July 12 / Week 2(1) -- Is Unipolarity Peaceful?**

- Stephen M. Walt, "Alliances in a Unipolar World," *World Politics*, Vol. 61 (2008): 86-120;
- Jack Snyder, Robert Y. Shapiro, and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon, "Free Hand Abroad, Divide and Rule at Home," *World Politics*, Vol. 61 (2008): 155-187;
- Nuno P. Monteiro, "Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful," dissertation chapter, University of Chicago, 2009.

### **Wednesday, July 14 / Week 2(2) -- Unipolarity in a Nuclear World**

- Scott D. Sagan and Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), selections;
- Keir Lieber and Daryl Press, "The End of MAD? The Nuclear Dimension of US Primacy," *International Security*, Vol. 30 (2006): 7-44;
- Robert Jervis, "Why Nuclear Superiority Doesn't Matter," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 94 (1979/80): 617-633.

### **Friday, July 16 / Week 2(3) -- Unipolarity and Grand Strategy**

- Robert J. Art, *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003), chapters 1-3;
- William Clinton, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (The White House, February 1995), skim;

- George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (The White House, September, 2002), skim.

## **PART II: CONSTRAINTS ON AMERICAN UNIPOLARITY**

### **Monday, July 19 / Week 3(1) -- The Balancing Constraint**

- Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment" *International Security* Vol. 31, No. 2 (2006);
- Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, *World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), chapter 2.

### **Wednesday, July 21 / Week 3(2) -- The Soft-Balancing Constraint**

- Robert A. Pape, "Soft Balancing against the United States," *International Security* Vol. 30, No. 1 (2005);
- T. V. Paul, "Soft Balancing in the Age of U.S. Primacy," *International Security* Vol. 30, No. 1 (2005);
- Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, *World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), chapter 3;
- Keir A. Lieber and Gerard Alexander, "Waiting for Balancing: Why the World Is Not Pushing Back," *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (2005): 109-139.

### **Friday, July 23 / Week 3(3) -- The Institutional Constraint**

- Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "International Relations Theory and the Case against Unilateralism," *Perspectives on Politics* Vol. 3, No. 3 (2005);
- Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, *World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), chapter 5.

### **Monday, July 26 / Week 4(1) -- The Legitimacy Constraint**

- Martha Finnemore, "Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn't All It's Cracked Up to Be," *World Politics*, Vol. 61 (2008): 58-85;
- Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, *World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), chapter 6.

## **PART III: CHALLENGES TO AMERICAN UNIPOLARITY**

### **Wednesday, July 28 / Week 4(2) -- Small Wars**

- Daryl G. Press, "The Myth of Air Power in the Persian Gulf War and the Future of Warfare," *International Security*, Vol. 26 (2001): 5-44;
- Barry Posen, "The War for Kosovo: Serbia's Political-Military Strategy," *International Security*, Vol. 24 (2000): 39-84;

- Stephen Biddle, "Allies, Airpower, and Modern Warfare: The Afghan Model in Afghanistan and Iraq," *International Security*, Vol. 30 (2005/06): 161-76.

### **Friday, July 30 / Week 4(3) -- Occupation and Insurgency**

- David Edelstein, "Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail," *International Security*, Vol. 29 (2004): 49-91;
- Stephen Biddle, "Allies, Airpower, and Modern Warfare: The Afghan Model in Afghanistan and Iraq," *International Security*, Vol. 30 (2005/06): 161-76;
- Seth Jones, "The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency," *International Security*, Vol. 32 (2008): 7-40;
- Jason Lyall and Isaiah Wilson III, "Rage Against the Machines: Explaining Outcomes in Counterinsurgency Wars," *International Organization*, Vol. 63 (2009): 67-106.

### **Monday, August 2 / Week 5(1) -- Nuclear Proliferation**

- Barry Posen, "U.S. Security Policy in a Nuclear-Armed World, Or: What if Iraq Had Had Nuclear Weapons?" *Security Studies*, Vol. 6 (1997): 1-31;
- Charles Glaser and Steve Fetter, "National Missile Defense and the Future of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy," *International Security*, Vol. 26 (2001): 40-92.

### **Wednesday, August 4 / Week 5(2) -- Non-State Actors**

- Robert Pape, "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97 (2003): 343-361;
- John Mueller, "Is There Still a Terrorist Threat? The Myth of the Omnipotent Enemy," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85 (September/October 2006);

## **PART IV: THE END OF AMERICAN UNIPOLARITY?**

### **Friday, August 6 / Week 5(3) -- The Rise of Peer Competitors I: China**

- Robert Pape, "Empire Falls," *National Interest*, No. 99 (2009): 21-34;
- Stephen Van Evera, "A Farewell to Geopolitics," in Leffler and Legro, editors, *To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008): 11-35;
- Aaron Friedberg, "The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?" *International Security*, Vol. 30 (2005): 7-45;
- Thomas Christensen, "Fostering Stability or Creating a Monster? The Rise of China and U.S. Policy toward East Asia," *International Security* Vol. 31, No. 1 (2006).