

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Course Title | : | War and Peace |
| Course Code | : | POL3218 |
| No. of Credits per Term | : | 3 |
| Mode of Tuition | : | Lecture-Tutorial |
| Class Contact Hours | : | 3 hours per week |
| Category | : | Political Science Elective |

Brief Course Description

This course studies security issues in an anarchic international order, which makes security “scarce” for nation-states. The course examines the causes of the shortage of security from various perspectives. These include the insights of structural realism, defensive realism, and offensive realism. War and peace constitute core issues for the study of international security. In that context, the course will study different theories of the causes of war that span structural forces, domestic-level factors, and leaders’ decision-making. It will also explore alternative strategies to maintain peace and stability and these include balance of power, nuclear deterrence, interdependence, democratic peace, and collective security.

Aims

The main aim is to enhance students’ understanding of the causes of insecurity and conflicts from both historical and contemporary angles. This course should give students’ the ability to make sense of on-going security challenges facing the nation-states as well the world community. Moreover, students should be able to identify alternative strategies to achieve security in the world.

Learning Outcomes (LOs)

Upon completion of this course students should be:

1. equipped to read and understand the literature on international security issues.
2. able to critically evaluate contemporary security issues around the world.
3. able to analyse the alternative benefits of different strategies to achieve peace and stability

Teaching Method

Seminar approach with lectures, tutorial presentations and discussions mixed; with an expectancy of high interaction between students and instructor in a lively learning environment and resulted in a better learning outcome.

Assessment

Participation in classroom discussions: 10%

Presentation: 10%

Research paper: 30%

Final exam: 50%

Research Paper

The term paper should be at least 12 pages long and the due date will be 6 December. It should have clear arguments, careful analyses and ample evidence.

Readings

There are no required textbooks. You can now access almost all the readings through the library's newly created "Course Readings@library" system.

Topics

Sept 6. Introduction

Sept 13. The Concepts of Security and Why Security Is Scarce

David Baldwin, "The Concept of Security," in *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (1997), pp. 5-26

William Wohlforth, "Realism," in Duncan Snidal and Christian Reus-Smit, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 131-149.

Jeffrey Taliaffero, "Security Seeking Under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Revisited," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Winter 2000/01), pp. 126-161.

Sept 20. Causes of War: Structural Level Perspectives

Kenneth Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Perspective," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 615-628

John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), Chapters 1, 2, 5,9

Dale Copeland, *Cause of Major War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), Chapter 1.

Charles F. Doran, "War and Power Dynamics: Economic Underpinnings," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (1983), pp. 419-441.

George Modelski and Patrick M. Morgan, "Understanding Global War," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (September 1985), pp. 391-417.

Ronald L. Tammen and Jacek Kugler, *Power Transition: Strategies for the 21st Century* (New York: Chatham House, 2000), Chapter 1.

Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 1-50.

Sept 27. Causes of War: Domestic and Individual Level Perspectives

Randall Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bring the Revisionist State Back In," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Summer 1994), pp. 72-107.

J. Davison, *The Origins of Revisionist and Status-Quo States* (New York: Palgrave, 2012)

Jack Snyder, *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

James Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War," *International Organization*, Vol. 49, No. (1995), pp. 379-414 (Only read 379-384, 390-393, 397-400, 404-408, ignoring the math)

Robert Jarvis, "War and Misperception," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 675-700

Daniel Byman and Kenneth Pollack, "Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bring the Statesmen Back In," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Spring 2001). pp. 107-146.

Oct 4. Causes of World War I

Samuel R. Williamson, Jr., "The Origins of World War I," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 795-818.

Stephen Van Evera, "The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War," *International Security*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 58-104.

Oct 11. Causes of World War II

Scott D. Sagan, "The Origins of the Pacific War," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 893-922.

Jeffrey L. Hughes, "The Origins of World War II in Europe: British Deterrence Failure and German Expansionism," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 851-891.

Oct 18. The Cold War

X, "Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs*, (July 1947), pp. 566-582

Paul C. Avey. 2012. "Confronting the Soviet Power: US Policy during the Early Cold War," *International Security*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Spring 2012), pp. 151-188.

John Lewis Gaddis, "The Long Peace: Elements of Stability in the Post War International System," *International Security*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Spring 1986), pp. 99-142.

Oct 25. **To be arranged**

Nov 1. Building Peace: Balance of Power and Alliances

Stephen Walt, "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power," *International Security*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Spring 1985), pp. 3-43.

Brett Ashley Leeds, "Do Alliances Deter Aggression? The Influence of Military Alliances on the Initiation of Military Conflicts," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 47m No. 3 (July 2003), pp. 427-439.

Jack Levy, "Alliance Formation and War Behavior: An Analysis of the Great Powers, 1495-1986," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 87, No. 4 (December 1981),

pp 581-613.

Jack Levy and William Thompson, "Balancing on Land and at Sea: Do States Ally Against the Leading Global Power?" *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Summer 2010), pp. 7-43.

Jack Levy and William Thompson, "Hegemonic Threats and Great Power Balancing in Europe, 1495-1999," *Security Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (January-March 2005), pp. 1-33.

Nov 8. Building Peace: Nuclear Deterrence

Scott Sagan, "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb," *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Winter 1996/97), pp. 54-86.

Vipin Narang, "What Does it Take to Deter? Regional Power Nuclear Postures and International Conflict," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 57, No. 3 (June 2013), pp. 478-508.

Kenneth Waltz, "Why Iran Should Get the Bomb: Nuclear Balancing Would Mean Stability," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2012, pp. 2-5.

Robert Jervis, "Why Nuclear Superiority Doesn't Work," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Winter 1979-80), pp. 617-633.

Matthew Kroenig, "Nuclear Superiority and the Balance of Resolve: Explaining Nuclear Crisis Outcomes," *International Organization*, Vol. 67, No. 1 (Winter 2013), pp. 141-171.

Nov 15. Building Peace: Economic Interdependence and Democracy

Edward D. Mansfield and Brian M. Pollins, "The Study of Interdependence and Conflict: Recent Advances, Open Questions, and Directions for Future Research," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 45, No. 6 (December 2001), pp. 834-859.

Susan M. McMillan, "Interdependence and Conflict," *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (May 1997), pp. 33-58.

Dale C. Copeland, "Economic Interdependence and War: A Theory of Trade Expectations," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Spring 1996), pp. 5-41.

Havard Hegre, "Democracy and Armed Conflict," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (March 2014), pp. 159-172.

Sabastian Rosato, "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (November 2003), pp. 585-602.

Nov 22. Building Peace: International Institutions, Concerts, and Collective Security

Robert Keohan, "International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?" *Foreign Policy*, No. 110, (Spring 1998), pp. 82-96

David Lake, "Beyond Anarchy: The Importance of Security Institutions," *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (Summer 2001), pp. 129-160.

Bruce Russett, John R. Oneal and David R. Davis, "The Third Leg of the Kantian Tripod for Peace: International Organizations and Militarized Disputes, 1950-1985," *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 3 (Summer 1998), pp. 441-467.

John Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Winter 1994/95), pp. 5-49.

Robert Jarvis, "From Balance to Concert: A Study of International Security Cooperation," *World Politics*, Vol. 38, No. 1 (October 1995), pp. 58-79.

Charles Kupchan and Clifford Kupchan, "The Promise of Collective Security," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Summer 1995), pp. 52-61.

Andrew Butfoy, "Collective Security: Theory, Problems and Reformulations," *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (1993), 1-14/

Nov 29. The End of Unipolarity and Rising Geopolitical Rivalry

William C. Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World," *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Summer 1999), pp. 5-41.

Nuno P. Monteiro, "Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful," *International Security*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Winter 2011/12), pp. 9-40.

Christopher Layne, "This Time It's Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (March 2013), pp. 203-213.

Adam P. Liff and G. John Ikenberry, "Racing Toward Tragedy: China's Rise, Military Competition in the Asia Pacific, and the Security Dilemma," *International Security*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (Fall 2014), pp. 52-91.

Thomas Wright, "China and Russia vs. America: Great Power Revisionism Is Back," The Brookings Institution, April 15, 2015.

Department of Defense, "Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy of the United States of America," Washington DC, 2018.

Tutorial Topics

Sept 23 and 24

George Modelski and Patrick M. Morgan, "Understanding Global War," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (September 1985), pp. 391-417.

Oct 8 and 9

Stephen Van Evera, "The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War," *International Security*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 58-104.

Oct 15-16

Scott D. Sagan, "The Origins of the Pacific War," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 893-922.

Oct 22 and 23

John Lewis Gaddis, "The Long Peace: Elements of Stability in the Post War International System," *International Security*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Spring 1986), pp. 99-142.

Nov 5 and 6

Jack Levy and William Thompson, "Balancing on Land and at Sea: Do States Ally Against the Leading Global Power?" *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Summer 2010), pp. 7-43.

Nov 12 and 13

Scott Sagan, "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb," *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Winter 1996/97), pp. 54-86.

Nov 19 and 20

Dale C. Copeland, "Economic Interdependence and War: A Theory of Trade Expectations," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Spring 1996), pp. 5-41.

Nov 19 and 20

Robert Jarvis, "From Balance to Concert: A Study of International Security Cooperation," *World Politics*, Vol. 38, No. 1 (October 1995), pp. 58-79.

Rubric for the Final Exam

| Criteria | Excellent | Proficient | Meets Minimum Standard | Below Standard | Marks |
|--|--|---|---|---|-------|
| Comprehension of all the relevant concepts. (40%) | Demonstrates a deep insightful level of understanding (40) | Demonstrates a good surface level of understanding (30) | Demonstrates a fair level of surface understanding (20) | Demonstrates an inadequate level of understanding (0-10) | |
| Application of concepts to the problem posed. (40%) | Appropriate concepts are all applied correctly, (40) | Most concepts are applied correctly (30) | Some concepts are applied at too general a level or misapplied but the central ones are applied correctly and specifically (20) | Most concepts are applied at too general a level or misapplied (0-10) | |
| Extent to which ideas are expressed logically, accurately and clearly. (10%) | Expression of ideas is consistently accurate, logical and clear (10) | Expression of ideas is generally accurate, logical and clear with some minor lapses (8) | Expression of ideas is comprehensible but there are some major lapses (6) | Largely incomprehensible with some major inconsistencies and errors (0-3) | |
| Quality of English. (10%) | English is consistently excellent (10) | English is proficient with no major errors (8) | English conveys the essential meaning but contains a number of errors (6) | English is below acceptable university standard (0-3) | |
| Total Marks | A(above 85) | B(above 80) | C(above 70) | D(above 60), F(below 60) | |

Rubric for Presentation and classroom discussions

| Domain | | A (Above 85) | B (Above 80) | C (Above 70) | D (Above 60) | F (Below 60) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Presentation | Arguments/ points | Clear stance and able to offer many cogent arguments/points | Clear stance and able to offer some major cogent arguments/points | Ambiguous stance without addressing a few major arguments/points | Ambiguous stance leaving many major arguments/points untouched | No stance at all and/or only descriptions |
| | Structure | Logical flow and systematic arrangements | Logical but not structured very systematically | Logical but the structure is very weak | Little evidence of a logical structure | No logical structure at all |
| | Language | Speaking fluently and writing grammatically | Clear but a few grammar or pronunciation problems | Clear but with some grammar and pronunciation problems | Only occasionally clear | Unable to express clearly |
| Discussion (Q/A) | Answering critics (presenters) | Answer all major criticisms squarely and cogently + Rebut with comments | Answer some major criticisms squarely and cogently | Address some minor criticisms selectively | Referring to some minor criticisms but not able to answer them | Skip all criticisms |
| | Posing questions (discussants) | Questions with potentials of shaking the major foundations of the opponents' arguments + Offering own views in the questions | Questions touching on some key weaknesses of the opponents' arguments + Offering own views in the questions | Questions being too general to reveal weaknesses of the opponents' arguments + No own views offered in the questions | Questions only to invite opponents to re-state/clarify their arguments + Raising very few questions | Raising no questions |
| | Examples | Citing appropriate and enough examples and elaborate them well | Citing some important and relevant examples, but not much elaboration | Examples cited are relevant but not that important | Examples cited, but not relevant or important | No example offered |
| | Manner | Show a high level of confidence, humbleness and clear-mindedness | Show some confidence and ability to reason but occasionally disturbed by emotions | Not enough confidence; some evidence of escaping reason and passivity; occasionally disturbed by emotions | Little confidence; difficulty of offering reasons; evidence of showing passivity | Failure to exercise self-control/discipline and not able to participate at all |

Topic : _____

Tutorial Group No. : _____

Students' Name : _____

Rubric for the Research Paper

| | Excellence – Good | Satisfactory | Fair | Poor | GRADE |
|---|---|---|--|---|--------------|
| | (Above 80) | (Above 70) | (Above 60) | (Below 60) | |
| Content (30%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most materials pertinent to the topic under research are well-covered and surveyed; ● Most facts, data, opinions, etc. are precisely reported, interpreted and discussed; ● Evidence of wide range of research; ● Well use of quotations and paraphrasing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some materials pertinent to the topic under research are covered and surveyed; ● Some facts, data, opinions, etc. are reported, interpreted and discussed; ● Evidence of reasonable research; ● Direct quotations may be overused or not used effectively. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited materials pertinent to the topic under research are covered and surveyed; ● Limited facts, data, opinions, etc. are reported, interpreted and discussed; ● Evidence of limited understanding of the topic; ● Generally over reliance on direct quotation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Little materials pertinent to the topic under research are covered and surveyed; ● Little facts, data, opinions, etc. are reported, interpreted and discussed; ● No evidence of understanding of the topic. | |
| Analysis (40%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Well focused; ● Good use of the ideas stated in the core reading to support your argument; ● Offer own viewpoints frequently; ● Critically examine others' viewpoints; ● Use materials critically. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reasonably focused but with some arguments unsupported and some material irrelevant; ● Ideas of the core reading are used effectively sometimes; ● Sometimes offer own viewpoints; ● Sometimes examine others' viewpoints critically; ● Use materials with some criticisms. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited focus with many unsupported arguments; ● Ideas of the core reading are often not used effectively; ● Seldom offer own viewpoints; ● Seldom examine others' viewpoints critically; ● Use materials with limited criticisms. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Almost no focus; ● Irrelevant sections; ● Almost no own viewpoints offered; ● Never examine others' viewpoints critically; ● Use materials without criticisms. | |
| Coherence and Organization (20%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good overall organization with introduction and conclusion; ● Main body is clearly divided into sections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Organization generally clear but some limitations concerning the introduction, conclusion and paragraphing; ● Reasonable use of subheadings and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Organization unclear but some arguments are presented clearly; ● Subheadings used but not very | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of logical organization; ● No discernable introduction/ conclusion. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | with suitable paragraphing. | linking devices. | reasonable sometimes. | | |
| | | | | | |
| Language Fluency & Presentation (10%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good/average command of academic language; ● Easy for readers to understand; ● Good presentation, in line with conventions, of cover page, reference list, appendices, page numbers and overall layout. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some mistakes in use of language; ● Generally easy to read; ● Satisfactory. Some mistakes in referencing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited communicative competence; ● Readers may struggle to understand some sections; ● Fair. Many mistakes in referencing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extremely limited communicative competence; ● Inability to use simple language accurately; ● Little or no attention paid to the presentation of cover page, reference list, and so on. | |
| TOTAL | | | | | |