

Comparative Civil-Military Relations
Political Science 785
Syracuse University
Prof. Brian Taylor
Spring 2013

Classroom: MAX 315
Class time: T 3:30-6:15

Office: 531 Eggers
Office Hours: W 12-2,
or by appointment
E-mail: bdtaylor@maxwell.syr.edu
Phone: 443-3713

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is a graduate seminar on the major themes and debates in the study of civil-military relations (CMR). In every modern state the question of the proper balance between the armed forces and the civilian political leadership is a key feature of politics. In the most extreme cases, the military itself takes power. In established democracies civil-military relations do not take this extreme form, but there are still important debates about the proper degree of military influence over defense and foreign policy, and the degree to which military policy should be responsive to broader social and cultural values.

This course has four separate units, which are intended to introduce you to the major issues in the study of civil-military relations. Most of these units could be courses in themselves, so we will only scratch the surface of the existing literature. These four units are:

1. Foundations: States, Militaries, Nations, and Military Professionalism
2. Who's In Charge? Military Intervention and Civilian Control
3. Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force
4. New Challenges in Civil-Military Relations

As a subject of inquiry civil-military relations cuts across many of the traditional field divisions in political science. Most of the issues we will discuss are traditionally thought of as either comparative politics or international relations topics, but we also will touch on themes from American politics and public policy/public administration. Although we will not study the subject in this manner, many important texts in political theory (e.g., *The Republic*; *The Prince*) also discuss issues that we now think of as civil-military relations.

It should be stressed that this is a course on **politics**, and not on military science or warfare. To the extent that we discuss actual wars, we will be focused on relations between the military and civilians in terms of political decision-making. Thus, even if you have little background (or even interest) in military history and military strategy, you should not feel at a disadvantage – this course is fundamentally, I repeat, about politics.

READINGS

Five required books have been ordered at the SU bookstore:

Zoltan Barany, *The Soldier and the Changing State: Building Democratic Armies in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas* (Princeton University Press, 2012).

Eliot A. Cohen, *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime* (Anchor Books, 2003).

Steven Cook, *Ruling But Not Governing: The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).

Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Belknap/Harvard, 1957).

Barry Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany Between the World Wars* (Cornell University Press, 1984).

The other readings for the class are journal articles or book chapters. They are available through Blackboard in the “Documents” section (**not** “Course Reserves”). Depending on interests and career plans, you may wish to search out used copies of many of the books from which we only have time to read small excerpts.

Note that the readings for each week are listed in the order in which I recommend you read them. This is **not** an indication of their importance, but there is a logic to how the readings fit together.

COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND GRADING

1) Attendance and Participation

This course is a seminar; attendance and participation every week are essential. Each student is expected to complete all the readings each week and to contribute to the seminar discussion. You should bring the week’s readings to class. Additionally, by 12:30 on Tuesday each student should email me 1 question or comment about the week’s readings. Your question/comment should be no more than a paragraph long, and should focus on the key themes of the readings. I am interested in what you think the most important issue(s) is/are, how you think the readings connect with each other, what you see as the major flaw(s) of the readings, or what you found particularly difficult or hard to understand about the readings. Failure to turn in a question or comment on time will affect your participation grade. Turning in a poorly thought out question in a rush just to fulfill the letter of the assignment definitely will be noticed. Class participation will be 20 percent of your grade; you will be graded both on the quantity and quality of your participation, including your emailed question or comment. Active participation is encouraged; however, frequent tangents can lower your participation grade, as will inappropriate laptop use.

2) *Research Paper*

The major written product for the course will be a paper on civil-military relations in one country. This paper will be written in stages and will focus on two of three key themes from the course. The three possible themes are:

- A. Who's in charge? (February 5, 12, 19, and 26);
- B. CMR and the use of force (March 5, 12, and April 2);
- C. The military and society (January 22 and March 26).

Everyone will write a paper on theme A (Who's in charge?) for your first paper. In this paper, you can focus on military rule, coups, or civilian control, depending on your country. For your second paper, you should write on EITHER theme B or theme C, depending on which topic is more relevant to your country and your own interests. These two papers should be about 10 pages long. At the end of the semester you will produce a 20-25 page paper that brings these two papers together into one coherent paper that provides an overview of civil-military relations in your country.

When you submit your reading question for January 22, please also submit a list of 3 countries you would most like to write on (rank ordered). I will assign everyone a country based on that preference; I will try to avoid too much duplication. If you have a prior interest in a particular country or region, you are encouraged to explore that interest here. As a general rule, larger and more prominent countries have more extensive literatures than those on smaller countries. Finally, no one can write on the US – we already have 3-4 weeks devoted mostly to the US.

It is essential that each of the shorter papers, as well as the finished product, are grounded in the theoretical literature on the relevant topics. The papers should not be a straightforward narrative. You should use the papers as a vehicle for applying, and potentially critiquing, the literature from the various units. You probably should not try to include all of the class readings on a particular theme, but you should definitely use these readings to give some framework to your analysis of your country. For example, the paper on “who's in charge” should be informed by the relevant readings on that topic. Depending on your country, it may make sense to concentrate either on the issue of military coups/non-coups, or mechanisms of civilian control. It also might make sense to focus on a specific time period.

You will be graded on how good a job you do of applying the relevant literature to your case and the quality of your research, as well as other important aspects of scholarly writing, including a clear introduction with a strong thesis statement, a coherent theme and structure, a good connection of evidence to theory, well-structured paragraphs (including topic sentences), correct usage and grammar, etc. The paper is expected to be a scholarly paper, with all that the phrase entails: footnotes/citations, bibliography, a coherent structure, and familiarity with relevant literature. Papers must be typed or word-processed. Be sure to proofread and spell-check the paper, and to number the pages. Your essay should also have a cover-sheet. You can use any standard citation style (footnotes, endnotes, embedded citations with attached reference list) you like, as long as you are consistent.

Feel free, of course, to discuss this paper assignment further with me. If this description is unclear, I trust the assignment will make more sense as the semester goes along. You may have noticed that I did not list the readings for January 29 as relevant to any of the 3 themes; that is because they are potentially relevant to ALL of the themes. Why this is so should also become clear as the semester goes along. There is also a separate paper assignment for that week. The readings for April 9 on Security Sector Reform may be incorporated into the “who’s in charge” section of the final paper if appropriate.

You are encouraged to consult Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Cornell University Press, 1997), for a brief discussion of the various ways a paper can use theory (theory testing, theory creation, explaining cases, etc.), and for suggestions on how to shape and write a research paper.

You should be familiar with how to use library resources, such as ProQuest Research Library, JSTOR, First Search, PAIS, Wilson Full Text, etc., to search for articles and books. If not, please seek help from a librarian. A well-structured search on Google Scholar (not Google) also can be helpful.

Two final points. First, you are highly encouraged to bring your case knowledge to seminar discussions. Because the course is organized more thematically than geographically, the readings pass over many important countries. Hopefully individual contributions from “experts” on these countries will somewhat fill the gap in our collective knowledge. Second, I strongly suggest that you start seeking out library resources very early. You also should consider getting materials through Interlibrary Loan that are not available at Syracuse, another reason to start your research early.

Each of the first-stage papers is due on a Friday (noted in the syllabus) by 12 p.m., hard copy required. The final paper is due on Monday, May 6 by 4:00 p.m. The first-stage papers are worth 15 percent of your grade each, the final paper counts for 30 percent of your final grade. Late papers will be graded down 1/3 letter grade for each day that they are late. Computer problems (disk failure, unable to find a printer, etc.), or other reasons/excuses of a similar nature, are not acceptable excuses for a late paper.

3) *Presentations*

The final three class sessions are reserved for student presentations on their papers. This is a chance for you to tell the class what you have learned, for you to get feedback before the final paper, and for us to benefit from your research. The length of the presentations will depend on final enrollment in the class.

Besides the presentation, each student will “assign” 1 article or book chapter on CMR in his/her country for everyone to read in advance. This reading should be a good general overview of CMR in your country. These articles will be distributed in advance to the rest of the class.

The presentations will be graded on clarity, preparedness, content, and length (i.e., neither too long nor too short). If you choose to use PowerPoint, I would caution not to overdo it, either by

having too many slides or by making slides too busy, cluttered, or wordy. Your presentation will count for 10 percent of your final grade.

4) *Huntington/Janowitz Reaction Paper*

Two of the most influential CMR books ever written are Samuel Huntington's *The Soldier and the State* and Morris Janowitz's *The Professional Soldier*. Huntington, in particular, has largely defined the terms of much writing on CMR. We therefore read large chunks of Huntington and an excerpt from Janowitz, as well as an article evaluating their contributions.

The week we read Huntington and Janowitz each student will write a short (5-7 pages, double-spaced) review essay. This essay should critically assess the readings for that week (Huntington, Janowitz, Feaver). The object of the essay is to identify the central issues that the readings address, to locate the authors' positions vis-à-vis those issues, and to comment critically on the value of the individual contributions. You should keep the following questions in mind: What are the central issues at stake in these readings? What are the principal arguments of the works under study? How do they relate to each other? What are the main theoretical or empirical strengths or weaknesses of the studies? How valuable and viable is the theory that each proposes (if it proposes a theory)? Your paper should go beyond a summary of the readings toward critical commentary and a discussion of the issues that unite the works. Note that critiques of "sins of commission," by which I mean flaws in what the author writes, are more persuasive than complaints about "sins of omission," things the author did not write about. This is particularly true since we are reading only excerpts from the books.

The papers will be evaluated according to the effectiveness and insight with which you illuminate the principal issues raised by the readings in an independent and critically-minded way. You obviously cannot cover all the conceivable issues raised by the readings, but you should certainly concentrate on the most important ones and eschew trivial issues. You should not consult any outside works for this assignment. The paper is due in class on January 29. Late papers will not be accepted for this assignment. Please hand in the paper with only your ID number to identify you, not your name, so I can grade the papers "blind." Your grade on this paper will constitute 10 percent of your final grade. You do not need to submit a question this week.

SUMMARY

Grades will be based on the following:

Class Participation	20%
Reaction Paper	10%
Presentation	10%
First-Stage Papers	30% (15% each)
Final Paper	30%

There is no final exam for the class.

COURSE POLICIES

Class communication: Probably the easiest way to reach me with brief questions is via e-mail, or grabbing me before or after class. More lengthy or detailed issues are probably best discussed during office hours.

Computers and cell phones: If you bring a laptop to class, it should be used **only** for taking notes or consulting assigned readings. It is both distracting and disrespectful to me and your colleagues if you are web-surfing, etc. when you are supposed to be participating in classroom discussion. I **do** notice, and it **will** affect your participation grade. Cell phones should be silent and put away, and texting in class is not allowed.

Academic misconduct: The Syracuse University Academic Integrity Policy holds students accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. The Policy states:

At Syracuse University, academic integrity is expected of every community member in all endeavors. Academic integrity includes a commitment to the values of honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, and respect.... An individual's academic dishonesty threatens and undermines the central mission of the University. It is unfair to other community members who do not cheat, because it devalues efforts to learn, to teach, and to conduct research. Academic dishonesty interferes with moral and intellectual development, and poisons the atmosphere of open and trusting intellectual discourse.

You should be familiar with the Policy; it is your responsibility to learn about instructor and general academic expectations with regard to proper citation of sources in written work. Plagiarism is the representation of another's words, ideas, opinions, or other products of work as one's own, either overtly or by failing to attribute them to their true source. The policy also governs the integrity of work submitted in exams and assignments. Serious sanctions can result from academic dishonesty of any sort. For more information and the complete policy, see <http://academicintegrity.syr.edu>. I particularly recommend the page on "What Does Academic Integrity Mean?" and the links from that page to writing resources at Harvard and Purdue universities.

A failure to develop good research and writing habits can negatively affect both your academic and professional career. University rules against plagiarism and academic dishonesty will be strictly enforced in this class. According to the policy, "the presumptive penalty for any act of academic dishonesty by a graduate student is suspension or expulsion from the University. A decision by a hearing panel to impose a penalty less than an suspension or expulsion for a graduate student requires a written explanation."

Disability-Related Accommodations: Students who are in need of disability-related academic accommodations must register with the Office of Disability Services (ODS), 804 University Avenue, Room 309, 315-443-4498. Students with authorized disability-related accommodations should provide a current Accommodation Authorization Letter from ODS to the instructor and review those accommodations with the instructor. Accommodations, such as exam

administration, are not provided retroactively; therefore, planning for accommodations as early as possible is necessary. For further information, see the ODS website, Office of Disability Services <http://disabilityservices.syr.edu/>

Religious holidays: SU's religious observances policy recognizes the diversity of faiths represented among the campus community and protects the rights of students, faculty, and staff to observe religious holy days according to their tradition. Under the policy, students are provided an opportunity to make up any examination, study, or work requirements that may be missed due to a religious observance provided they notify their instructors before the end of the second week of classes. An online notification process is available through MySlice/Student Services/Enrollment/My Religious Observances from the first day of class until the end of the second week of class.

IMPORTANT DATES TO REMEMBER

January 29	Reaction Paper Due
March 1	First Paper Due
April 5	Second Paper Due
May 6	Final Paper Due

COURSE SCHEDULE AND READINGS

FIRST UNIT: THE FOUNDATIONS

January 15: Introduction

This meeting is primarily administrative, and a chance to get acquainted.

At some point this week – perhaps tonight! -- you should review a US Army website on how army units are organized:

<http://www.army.mil/info/organization/unitsandcommands/oud/>

Be sure to click on the links for fuller descriptions of the different types of units.

You should also read the very brief (2 pp.) description of military ranks from James Dunnigan, *How to Make War*, pp. 308-309. This will be distributed in class.

January 22: States, Nations, Militaries, and War

Remember to submit email of country preferences with your question.

Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War* (Princeton University Press: 1832/1976), pp. 75-89, 585-594, 605-610 [**Blackboard**]

Max Weber, excerpt from "Politics as a Vocation," in Gerth and Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (Oxford University Press, 1946), 77-83. [Blackboard]

Charles Tilly, "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime," in Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol., eds., *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 169-191. [Blackboard]

Miguel Angel Centeno, "Limited Wars and Limited States," in Diane Davis and Anthony Pereira, eds., *Irregular Armed Forces and Their Role in Politics and State Formation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 82-95. [Blackboard]

Barry Posen, "Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power," *International Security*, 18, 2 (Fall 1993), pp. 80-124. [Blackboard]

Ronald Krebs, "A School for the Nation? How Military Service Does Not Build Nations, and How It Might," *International Security*, 28, 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 85-124. [Blackboard]

January 29: Huntington, Janowitz, and Military Professionalism

Reaction Paper due in class.

Huntington, *Soldier and the State*, pp. vii-viii, 1-157, 163-169, 177-180, 184-192, 345-346, 456-466.

Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier* (Free Press, 1960/1971), pp. 417-442. [Blackboard]

Peter Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces & Society*, 23, 2 (Winter 1996), pp. 149-178. [Blackboard]

SECOND UNIT: WHO'S IN CHARGE? MILITARY INTERVENTION & CIVILIAN CONTROL

February 5: Coups and Coup Theories

Brian D. Taylor, *Politics and The Russian Army: Civil-Military Relations, 1689-2000* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 6-30. [Blackboard]

Donald Horowitz, *Coup Theories and Officers' Motives: Sri Lanka in Comparative Perspective* (Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 3-15, 217-221. [Blackboard]

Samuel Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 1-5, 78-80, 192-263, 460-461. [Blackboard]

Eric Nordlinger, *Soldiers in Politics: Military Coups and Governments* (Prentice-Hall, 1977), pp. 63-78, 85-95. [Blackboard]

Philip Roessler, "The Enemy Within: Personal Rule, Coups, and Civil War in Africa," *World Politics*, 63, 2 (April 2011), pp 300-346. [Blackboard]

February 12: Coups and Military Dominance in the Middle East

James Quinlivan, "Coups-Proofing: Its Practice and Consequences in the Middle East," *International Security*, 24, 2 (Fall 1999), pp. 131-165. [Blackboard]

Cook, *Ruling But Not Governing*, ix-x, 1-32, 60-148.

Derek Lutterbeck, "Arab Uprisings, Armed Forces, and Civil-Military Relations," *Armed Forces and Society*, 39, 1 (January 2013), pp. 28-52. [Blackboard]

February 19: Building Democratic Armies, Part 1

Richard Kohn, "How Democracies Control the Military," *Journal of Democracy*, 8, 4 (October 1997), pp. 140-153. [Blackboard]

Barany, *The Soldier and the Changing State*, 1-110, 245-338.

February 26: Building Democratic Armies, Part 2

First Paper Due March 1, 12:00.

Larry Diamond, "Democracy's Third Wave Today," *Current History*, November 2011, pp. 299-307.

Barany, *The Soldier and the Changing State*, 113-242, 339-357.

Andrew Cottey, Timothy Edmunds, and Anthony Forster, "The Second Generation Problematic: Rethinking Democracy and Civil-Military Relations," *Armed Forces & Society*, 29, 1 (Fall 2002), pp. 31-56. [Blackboard]

THIRD UNIT: CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS AND THE USE OF FORCE

March 5: The European Experience

Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine*, pp. 7-80, 105-144, 163-167, 175-181, 192-193, 215-244.

Jack Snyder, "Civil-Military Relations and the Cult of the Offensive, 1914 and 1984," *International Security*, 9, 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 108-146. [Blackboard]

Elizabeth Kier, "Culture and Military Doctrine: France between the Wars," *International Security*, 19, 4 (Spring 1995), pp. 65-93. [Blackboard]

March 12: Spring Break

March 19: U.S. Experience: Vietnam to Iraq

Cohen, *Supreme Command*, pp. xi-xv, 1-14, 173-215, 225-64

H. R. McMaster, *Dereliction of Duty: Johnson, McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Lies That Led to Vietnam* (Harper Collins, 1997), pp. 323-334. **[Blackboard]**

Kenneth Campbell, "Once Burned, Twice Cautious: Explaining the Weinberger-Powell Doctrine," *Armed Forces & Society*, 24, 3 (Spring 1998), pp. 357-374. **[Blackboard]**

Michael Desch et. al., "Bush and the Generals," *Foreign Affairs*, 86, 3 (May/June 2007), pp. 97-108, **AND** "Salute and Disobey? The Civil-Military Balance, Before Iraq and After (Discussion of Desch)," *Foreign Affairs*, 86, 5 (September/October 2007), pp. 147-56. **[Blackboard]**

Richard Betts, "Are Civil-Military Relations Still a Problem?," in Suzanne Nielsen and Don Snider, *American Civil-Military Relations: The Soldier and the State in a New Era* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), pp. 11-41, 310-314. **[Blackboard]**

FOURTH UNIT: NEW CHALLENGES IN CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

March 26: U.S. Military & Society: The Postmodern Military & the Civil-Military "Gap"

Dwight Eisenhower, "Farewell Address," 17 January 1961, 4 pp. **[Blackboard]**

Charles Moskos, John Allen Williams, and David Segal, eds., *The Postmodern Military: Armed Forces after the Cold War* (Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 1-6, 11-13 ("Armed Forces after the Cold War"), 14-31 (Moskos: "Toward a Postmodern Military: The United States as a Paradigm"). **[Blackboard]**

James Burk, "The Military's Presence in American Society, 1950-2000," in Peter Feaver and Richard Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security* (MIT Press, 2001), pp. 247-274. **[Blackboard]**

MacKubin Thomas Owens, "Who Serves?," Chapter Four in *US Civil-Military Relations After 9/11: Renegotiating the Civil-Military Bargain* (continuum, 2011), pp. 128-171. **[Blackboard]**

Robert Goldrich, "American Military Culture from Colony to Empire," *Daedalus*, 140, 3 (Summer 2011), pp. 58-74. **[Blackboard]**

Karl Eikenberry, "Reassessing the All-Volunteer Force," *The Washington Quarterly*, 36, 1 (Winter 2013), pp. 7-24. **[Blackboard]**

April 2: Civil-Military Challenges of 21st Century Military Operations

Second Paper Due April 5, 12:00.

T.E. Lawrence, "The 27 Articles of T.E. Lawrence," *The Arab Bulletin*, 20 August 1917, 5 pp. [Blackboard]

Robert Egnell, "Explaining US and British performance in complex expeditionary operations: The civil-military dimension," *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 29, 6 (December 2006), pp. 1041-1075. [Blackboard]

The U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual (University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. 53-77. [Blackboard]

Fred Kaplan, "The End of the Age of Petraeus: The Rise and Fall of Counterinsurgency," *Foreign Affairs*, 92, 1 (January 2013), pp. 75-90. [Blackboard]

Nancy Roberts, "Spanning "Bleeding" Boundaries: Humanitarianism, NGOs, and the Civilian-Military Nexus in the Post-Cold War Era," *Public Administration Review*, 70, 2 (March/April 2010), pp. 212-222. [Blackboard]

Anna Leander, "Regulating the role of private military companies in shaping security and politics," in Simon Chesterman and Chia Lehnardt, eds., *From Mercenaries to Market: The Rise and Regulation of Private Military Companies* (Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 49-65. [Blackboard]

April 9: State Building and Security Sector Reform: Solution or Illusion?

Mark Sedra, *Security Sector Reform 101: Understanding the Concept, Charting Trends and Identifying Challenges* (CIGI, 2010), 23 pp. [Blackboard]

Robert Egnell and Peter Halden, "Laudable, Ahistorical, and Overambitious: Security Sector Reform Meets State Formation Theory," *Conflict, Security & Development*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (April 2009), pp. 27-54. [Blackboard]

Kimberly Marten, "Patronage versus Professionalism in New Security Institutions," *Prism*, 2, No. 4 (September 2011), pp. 83-98. [Blackboard]

Dipali Mukhopadhyay, "Disguised Warlordism & Combatanthood in Balkh: The Persistence of Informal Power in the Formal Afghan State," *Conflict, Security & Development*, 9, 4 (December 2009), pp. 535-64.

Sean McFate, "Lessons Learned from Liberia: Security Sector Reform in a Failed State," *RUSI Journal*, 153, 1 (February 2008), pp. 62-66; [Blackboard] **AND**

Sean McFate, "I Built an African Army," *Foreign Policy*, January 7, 2010, 3 pp. [Blackboard or [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/07/i built an african army](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/07/i_built_an_african_army)]

April 16: Student Presentations

April 23: Student Presentations

April 30: Student Presentations

MAY 6 FINAL PAPER DUE, 4 P.M.