

Duke University
Department of Political Science
PS 259: American Civil-Military Relations
Spring 2005

Course hours: Wednesday, 2:50-5:20
Class location: Blackwell 119
Office hours: TBD

Professor Peter Feaver (pfeaver@duke.edu)
Perkins 331
660-4331

Overview of Course:

The study of civil-military relations addresses a simple puzzle: can we have a military strong enough to protect civilians yet not so strong as to ignore or subvert civilian direction? After all, a military that is strong enough to defend the state from its external enemies is also strong enough to seize power so as to rule for itself. But if you keep your military small and weak so it will not pose a threat to society, will it be strong enough to carry out the national security policy? How do you ride the tiger of military capability without being swallowed by it?

Does this problem become more acute as civilian society loses its connection with the military? How distinctive must the culture and institutional setting of the military be from its host society to fulfill its special mission? Does the military's focus on the management of violence require military culture to stand apart from or even contrary to the civilian society from which it springs? Or should the military, particularly in a democracy, adapt to the culture of civilian society, reflecting civilian values and norms of behavior? What is the gap between military and civilian culture and what is its significance for public policy in America?

This course will look at the classic and recent literature addressing these questions and give students a chance to do original research on some aspect of the topic. The course will focus primarily on the U.S. case, but the theoretical frameworks covered have broad application to other advanced democracies and, indeed, have spawned a large literature considering civil-military relations in developing countries. The course will pay special attention to several recently completed research projects that have constituted my research agenda for the past decade.

Learning Objectives

- * To master the basic texts and arguments in American civil-military relations theory and practice.
- * To appreciate the richness of American civil-military relations and to be sensitive to questions that remain unsettled in the field.
- * To participate in ongoing research projects at the cutting edge of a social science field.
- * To cultivate research techniques, marshaling statistical, historical, and other data to answer specific empirical questions.

* To hone analytical skills and to refine one's ability to make a convincing argument.

Requirements and Grading

Oral Presentation	25%
Research Paper	50%
Class Participation	25%

Major Research Group Project:

You will break up into 3 separate groups to do a major research project. Two of the possible topics are already assigned: (1) civil-military relations and the war current Iraq war; and (2) the partisan politicization of the military. The third group is free to choose any civil-military topic, subject to my approval. Many topics would be fruitful, such as the military's relations with the media; or follow-on analysis of the TISS survey data; or the military and gender/sexual orientation issues; or the draft; or military-intelligence fusion in the global war on terror.

You will have two principal outputs for this project. The first, and most important, is a formal original essay, of roughly 15,000-20,000 words. Obviously, the essay can be broken down into sections for which individual students take primary responsibility, but the overall document must read like a single, coherent, co-authored product. It will receive a single grade, which all participants will earn. I will ask the group to report confidentially on any collective action problems and may adjust the grade as appropriate.

The grading criteria will be traditional: vigor of your argument; depth and breadth of your research; substantive quality of your insights; organization and integration of the chapters; the clarity of your writing; and the creativity of the project.

The writing for this project should be "formal" and even "social scientific." In general terms, social science writing involves an emphasis on argumentation; stating a thesis, marshaling evidence to support that thesis, identifying counter-arguments, and rebutting those arguments. Common mistakes include: telling the reader what you feel or believe as opposed to what can be proven empirically or logically; failing to anticipate obvious counter-arguments; lacking a thesis and/or a clear logical progression in the argument; a failure to do an adequate literature review; sloppy writing. The individual chapters will each receive a grade and the volume as a whole will also receive a grade.

The second output will be the class presentation, which should encompass an entire class session. You will select and assign readings. You will determine how best to cover the topic. You will take responsibility for ensuring that the students learn something about your issue and have an opportunity to engage your argument. I encourage you to be as creative as possible for this aspect of the assignment. If multimedia is called for, indulge us. If role-playing or drama make the point best, direct us. If we absolutely have to watch *Forrest Gump* to understand this problem, rent it and play it for us. The only requirement is that at some point you state your thesis, present supporting evidence, and stand ready to defend it against counterarguments launched (hopefully) by your peers in discussion. Everyone in the group will receive the same

grade which will be based partly on ambition (creativity, originality, etc.) and partly on successful execution (organization, involvement of the class, and so on). Readings must be available one week in advance.

The major paper will be due at 5:00 p.m. on 22 April. However, there will be interim deadlines to insure that you are making progress and have not hit any snags. These subsidiary assignments will not be graded:

- **Preliminary outline is due 2 February in class.**
- **A rough draft will be due my noon on 8 March, and presented in class on 9 March**
- **A revised draft is due one day before the group's assigned oral presentation in class.**

Beware! This assignment is considerably more difficult because it is a group rather than an individual project. I fully expect that you will have trouble coordinating the inputs of each members. Group projects are particularly challenging because they require the blending of individual skills and temperaments. Group projects are prone to the collective action problem of free riding. Yet they can be very rewarding and, in any case, are most likely your destiny because almost every task you face after college will be some variant of the dreaded group project.

Class Participation

Students are expected to attend every session, to have prepared thoroughly, and to participate actively in class discussions. To facilitate this, each student will submit 2 reaction papers throughout the semester. The papers (at most 2 pages) will summarize and respond to the readings, critically engaging them and raising questions that can serve as the springboard for class discussion. The papers will not receive a separate grade, but they will be factored into the student's class participation grade. **The papers will be due by noon the day before class.**

Readings

The following books have been ordered for purchase:

Samuel Huntington, *Soldier and the State* (Harvard, 1957)
Harry G. Summers, *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War* (Dell, 1982)
James Webb, *Fields of Fire*
Peter D. Feaver, *Armed Servants*
Peter D. Feaver and Christopher Gelpi, *Choosing Your Battles*
Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians*

Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*, may be out of print and therefore students are encouraged to hunt through used bookstores (such as abebooks.com, alibris.com, amazon.com) to purchase.

The shorter published readings are available on ereserve or on one of the electronic databases (Proquest) to which Duke subscribes. Longer readings are available in hard-copy reserves only.

PS 259: American Civil-Military Relations
Spring 2005
Class Schedule

- 1. Introduction** **19 January**
- Peter D. Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces & Society* Winter 1997, pp. 149-178
 - Peter D. Feaver, "Civil-Military Relations," in *Annual Review of Political Science* 1999. *I have copies for everyone in my office.*
 - Federalist Papers*, No. 8, 26, 47, 48, 51
 - Herbert J. Storing, ed., *The Anti-Federalist: Writings by the Opponents of the Constitution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), pp. 13-20, 145-158
 - Richard Kohn, "The Constitution and National Security: The Intent of the Framers," in Richard Kohn, ed., *The United States Military Under the Constitution*, pp. 61-94
- 2. Classical Theory: Huntington vs. Janowitz** **26 January**
- Carl V. Clausewitz, *On War*, Peter Paret translation (Princeton University Press, 1976), Book 1, pp. 83-142, and Book VIII, Chapter 6, pp. 728-737
 - Huntington, *Soldier and State*, pp. 1-97, 143-193, 456-466
 - Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier* (Free Press, 1971), pp. 3-103, 196-232
 - Charles C. Moskos, "Institutional and Occupational Trends in Armed Forces," in Charles C. Moskos and Frank Wood, *The Military: More Than Just a Job?* (Washington: Pergamon & Brassey's, 1988), pp. 15-26
 - David R. Segal, "Measuring the Institutional/Occupational Change Thesis," *Armed Forces & Society* 12, No. 3 (1986), pp. 351-376.
- 3. Civil-Military Relations During the Cold War** **2 February**
- Richard Betts, *Soldier, Statesmen, Cold War Crises*, pp. 1-30, 96-161, 214-236
 - Roy K. Flint, "The Truman-MacArthur Conflict: Dilemmas of Civil-Military Relations in the Nuclear Age," in Richard Kohn, ed., *The United States Military Under the Constitution*, pp. 223-267.
 - Aaron Friedberg, "Why Didn't the United States Become a Garrison State?" *International Security* 16, no. 4 (Spring 1992), pp. 109-142
 - Andrew J. Bacevich, "The Paradox of Professionalism: Eisenhower, Ridgway, and the Challenge to Civilian Control, 1953-1955." *Journal of Military History* 61, no. 2 (April 1997), pp. 303-333
 - Harry G. Summers, *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War*. Different editions have different chapter numbers and page numbers. I want us to read the following sections: from the Introduction through to the end of the chapter "Friction: The Bureaucracy"; also "Friction: The Doctrine;" also from "Tactics, Grand Tactics, and Strategy" through to the end of "Unity of Command;" and "Epilogue." If you use the Dell, 1982, edition, that translates into: pp. 21-84, 97-106, 151-204, 241-258; if you use the library reserve copy, which is Presidio, 1982, that translates into: pp. 1-52, 63-70, 108-150, 181-195.

-H. R. McMaster, *Dereliction of Duty* (Harper Collins, 1997), pp. 243-334

4. The Civil-Military Gap

9 February

- Lindsay Cohn, "The Evolution of the Civil-Military Gap Debate," paper prepared for the TISS Project on the Gap Between the Military and Civilian Society, *available at* www.duke.edu/~pfeaver/
- Thomas E. Ricks, "The Widening Gap Between the U.S. Military and U.S. Society," *The Atlantic Monthly* (July 1997), pp. 66-78.
- John Hillen, "Must Military Culture Matter?" *Orbis* 43, no. 1 (Winter 1999), pp. 43-58
- James Webb, "Military Leadership in a Changing Society," paper presented at the Naval War College Conference on Ethics, 16 November 1998
- Elizabeth Kier, "Discrimination and Military Cohesion: an Organizational Perspective" in Katzenstein and Reppy, eds., *Beyond Zero Tolerance* (Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., New York; 1999), pp. 25-52.
- Ole Holsti, "Of Chasms and Convergences: Attitudes and Beliefs of Civilians and Military Elites at the Start of a New Millennium," in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), pp. 15-100
- James Davis, "Attitudes and Opinions Among Senior Military Officers and a U.S. Cross-Section, 1998-99," in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), pp. 101-128
- Paul Gronke and Peter Feaver, "Uncertain Confidence: Civilian and Military Attitudes about Civil-Military Relations" in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), pp. 129-62
- David R. Segal, Peter Freedman-Doan, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley, "Attitudes of Entry-Level Enlisted Personnel: Pro-Military and Politically Mainstreamed," in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), pp. 163-212

5. Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force

16 February

- Chris Gacek, *The Logic of Force: The Dilemma of Limited War in American Foreign Policy* (Columbia 1994), pp. 1-24,
- Peter D. Feaver and Christopher Gelpi, *Choosing Your Battles*, entire
- Eliot Cohen, "The Unequal Dialogue: The Theory and Reality of Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force," in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), pp. 429-458

6. Neo-Institutionalist Theories

23 February

- Michael C. Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1999), pp. 1-21,
- Deborah Avant, *Political Institutions and Military Change: Lessons From Peripheral Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 1-20
- Peter D. Feaver, *Armed Servants*, Chapters 1-5

- 7. Post-Cold War “Crisis”** **2 March**
- Charles Dunlap (USA) “The Origins of the American Military Coup of 2012,” in *Parameters* (Winter 1992-1993), pp. 2-20
 - Richard Kohn, “Out of Control,” *National Interest* (Spring 1994)
 - “Exchange on Civil-Military Relations” with Colin Powell, John Lehman, William Odom, Samuel Huntington and Richard Kohn, *National Interest* (Summer 1994)
 - Russell F. Weigley, “The American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell,” *Journal of Military History* (October 1993), pp. 27-58
 - Deborah Avant, “Are the Reluctant Warriors Out of Control? U.S. Military Reluctance to Respond to Post-Cold War Low-Level Threats,” *Security Studies* 6 (Number 2, Winter 1996/97), pp. 51-90
 - Peter D. Feaver, *Armed Servants*, Chapters 6
 - Michael Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military*, pp. 22-38
- 8. Preliminary Review of Group Papers** **9 March**
- rough drafts due the day before, 8 March
- 9. Post-Cold War Case Studies** **23 March**
- Peter D. Feaver, *Armed Servants*, Chapters 7, 8
 - Eliot Cohen, CS-03 - *Obligations of Leadership. The Khobar Towers' Bombing and its Aftermath* Dr. Eliot A. Cohen, CSE
 - Eliot A. Cohen, “Kosovo and the New American Way of War,” in Andrew J. Bacevich and Eliot A. Cohen, eds., *War Over Kosovo: Politics and Strategy in a Global Age*, pp. 38-62
 - Andrew J. Bacevich, “Neglected Trinity: Kosovo and the Crisis in U.S. Civil-Military Relations,” in Andrew J. Bacevich and Eliot A. Cohen, eds., *War Over Kosovo: Politics and Strategy in a Global Age*, pp. 155-188
 - 9/11 Commission Report*, pp. 71-143
 - Richard A. Clarke, *Against All Enemies*, Chapter 8, pp. 181-204
- 10. Group Presentation: Iraq** **30 March**
- readings assigned by class
- 11. Group Presentation: Partisanship in the Military** **6 April**
- readings assigned by class
- 12. Group Presentation: TBD** **13 April**
- readings assigned by class
- 13. Civil-Military Relations and Combat** **20 April**
- * Richard Holmes, *Acts of War: The Behavior of Men in Combat*, pp. 270-359
 - * James Webb, *Fields of Fire* (skim entire)
- 14. Wrap Up** **27 April**