

U.S. National Security: Institutions, Process, and Policy – POL 2083

Spring 2021, January 11 – April 27
University of Cincinnati, Department of Political Science
Synchronous online course
Monday / Wednesday / Friday, 2:30 – 3:25

Instructor: Dr. Andrew A. Szarejko (szarejaa@ucmail.uc.edu)
Office Hours: Wednesday and Friday, 3:30 – 4:30, and by appointment

Course Description and Goals

How does the United States secure itself? In this seminar-style class on U.S. National Security, we will focus on this process by which U.S. policy-makers seek to ensure the country's security and prosperity with a particular emphasis on the short-term, day-to-day challenges policy-makers face. We will start the course by thinking about different conceptualizations of security—what does it mean to “secure” the United States? We will then spend about half the class focusing on different actors involved in the creation and implementation of U.S. national security policy and the tools available these actors. We will then spend much of the latter half of the course examining contemporary debates about how best to address perceived threats. We will conclude the course by reflecting on the future of U.S. national security policy. Through the readings, writing assignments, class discussions, and guest talks, this course will seek to help you think about how U.S. national security policy is implemented, why it takes the shape that it does, and how it might change.

Requirements

Attendance & Participation

Due to COVID-19, this course will be conducted online and synchronously. That is, we will have mandatory live meetings via Microsoft Teams. I will run this course as a seminar—I will provide brief lectures at the beginning of each week, and we will have guest talks for most weeks of the course, but this will primarily be a discussion-based class. Participation will thus constitute a large portion of your grade. Good participation in this course will entail making comments or asking questions that provide evidence of having done the readings and having paid attention to lectures—that is, it is not the quantity but the quality of your in-class participation that will determine your participation grade.

Attendance is a necessary but insufficient condition for a good participation grade in this class. In addition to making routine contributions to in-class discussions, I will designate at least one of you as a “first mover” for each week. After I start the week with a short lecture on the topic, I will ask the first mover to present their own 5- to 10-minute summary of the day's reading. Your summaries should focus on the questions authors are asking, the answers they provide, and how they substantiate their answer. That is, what methods do they use, what evidence do they provide, and how (if at all) do they engage with plausible counter-arguments? After the first mover provides the day's summary, I will ask a question about the reading to start our discussion. We will not have any first movers in the first or last week of class, and first movers

do not have any responsibilities when we have a guest speaker. I will use the first week to solicit your preferences as to when you would like to be a first mover, and I will aim to assign everyone their first or second choice if possible.

My lectures may make use of PowerPoint slides, and when they do, I will post the slides on Canvas. For your summaries as first mover, you are not obligated to use slides, but if you do prefer to use some, you are not required to send them to me. I will generally record our sessions, including guest talks (unless a guest speaker asks for the session not to be recorded), and I will post the recordings to Canvas.

Please notify me as soon as possible if any documented medical, family/personal, or religious exceptions are likely to interfere with your regular participation in the course. Emergencies may not allow you time to e-mail in advance; in such cases, just notify me as soon as possible via email. I hope that you all stay well this semester, and I will try to be flexible as exigencies arise.

Note that lectures and other class materials should not be disseminated to anyone outside the class.

Readings

Each week includes two or three readings depending on how many class sessions we have that week, and they are arranged in order. (There is one week that includes four readings, and we will discuss the first two readings that Monday.) For a week with three readings for three class sessions, you should complete the first reading before our first class session of the week (and so on). If possible, however, I would recommend completing all of a week's assigned readings by the beginning of each week. I will make all materials freely available online through Canvas and/or through a link on the syllabus. Please note that I may change any of the readings or assignments listed below, but I will communicate any such changes in advance. If you have any trouble accessing any materials, please let me know. Note that readings marked as "recommended" are optional.

Good participation and paper grades alike will require you to have a strong comprehension of the material covered in both the readings and the lectures. I have tried to keep the reading load manageable while also covering essential material. In some cases, I have assigned public-facing pieces instead of peer-reviewed journal articles to ensure we can cover an appropriate range of material without over-burdening you. I do assign many journal articles and book excerpts, however, and the methods some scholars use may be unfamiliar to you. I will discuss methods used in Political Science in the first week of the course, but you don't need to understand every methodological choice that appears in the readings—rather, you should focus on identifying the core argument and trying to understand why it does or does not seem convincing to you. If unfamiliarity with any method impedes your understanding of a piece, please feel free to raise the issue in class or in office hours.

In addition to the specific assigned reading for the class, you should be reading the international affairs section of a major national newspaper, such as the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*, on a daily basis. Although this is not a class focused on current events, many of our

discussions will make reference to such events, and familiarity with ongoing developments will be useful in approaching the subject.

Reading Response Papers

I will ask you to complete two reading response papers throughout the course. The course is divided into four sections, and you will need to complete one reading response each in the second and third sections (i.e., “Actors and Tools” and “Contemporary Issues”). Within those three sections, you will need to pick two assigned readings (not necessarily from the same week, but they must not be from the week when you were a first mover). After choosing your two readings, you should (1) identify a favorite sentence in each reading—something especially important or interesting, (2) explain why you found these items so interesting, and (3) explain how your two chosen pieces complement or contrast with each other. Each paper should be between 500 and 750 words. You should upload a reading response paper no later than 5 PM on the date of the last class in that section (March 19 and April 16).

Literature Review

In 500 to 750 words (or up to 1,000 words at your discretion), identify a current issue in U.S. National Security and provide an overview of some of the scholarly literature on the subject. This paper should identify at least four peer-reviewed academic articles or books, explain why the authors of those pieces see the issue as something important for policy-makers to address, and explain what the authors recommend policy-makers do to support U.S. national security.

You should get my approval for your topic by February 26, and the literature review will be due by 5:00 PM on March 26.

Final Paper/Project

There will be also be a final paper or project—you may choose either of the following options:

- 1) Paper: In 1,500 to 2,000 words and focusing on the issue you identified for your literature review, explain how U.S. policy-makers are divided on that issue, make an argument as to how the United States should approach that issue, address at least two plausible counter-arguments, and conclude with a discussion of how future research could help guide future policy-makers facing this or similar issues. This paper should make reference to at least three course readings and at least three external peer-reviewed journal articles or university-press books.
- 2) Project: Address the same points required of the final paper, but do so in 1) a short film of five to ten minutes, 2) a podcast of eight to twelve minutes, or 3) some other medium of artistic expression (with my approval). Whichever medium you choose, you should also make reference to at least three course readings and at least three external peer-reviewed journal articles or university-press books, but depending on your medium of choice, this could include either a verbal reference to those sources or an annotated bibliography. If you plan to take this option, we will discuss how best to reference sources in your chosen medium.

The final paper/project will be due by 5:00 PM on April 27. We will discuss all of these assignments further in class, but if anything remains unclear, I encourage you to contact me via email or in office hours.

You should submit all of the written assignments on Canvas as Word or Pages files (.doc, .docx, or .pages, not as PDFs, please), and the documents should be double-spaced and typed in 12-point Times New Roman font with standard spacing, 1-inch margins, and page numbers in the upper right-hand corner. I ask that you use footnotes as opposed to in-text, author-date citations, and you should submit a bibliography with the final paper or project. I prefer the Chicago Manual of Style for citations (see [here](#)), but I will not deduct points for citations so long as you consistently provide all relevant bibliographical information. Please note that I will not include headers, titles, page numbers, footnotes, or bibliographies in the word count for your papers (but do not abuse the space in the footnotes, please). For the final project, you should be able to submit audio or video files on Canvas as well, but let me know if you have any technical issues with such submissions.

Procedures

Office Hours and E-mail Etiquette

I will hold virtual office hours on Teams twice a week, during which you are free to come discuss any relevant academic matters with me. I encourage you to come for substantive questions about readings, lectures, and assignments (e.g., the sort of questions that might be difficult to answer briefly via email), but I am also happy to discuss related academic matters such as post-graduate plans, internship ideas, and the like. I will provide further details on this in our first class session.

I also encourage you to send me questions by email. When doing so, please include POL 2083 in the subject line. Please address me as Dr. or Prof. Szarejko (and please address all our guest speakers in the same way unless they ask you to address them otherwise). If you send me an email and do not receive a reply within 24 hours, please follow up to remind me of your question. If it is a time-sensitive matter, you may follow up sooner as well, but keep in mind that I might not reply immediately to emails sent at odd hours.

Green Teaching and Learning

I borrow from American University's Center for Teaching, Research, and Learning to encourage "green" teaching and learning [practices](#). For this online class, I would encourage you to read this syllabus and all other assigned readings on a laptop or tablet, and I would also encourage you to take notes on a laptop/tablet rather than on paper. That said, [research](#) suggests that hand-writing notes can be better for recall and comprehension, so it's your call. If you opt for the latter, I would suggest you try to minimize paper usage by writing on recycled paper and maximizing the amount of writing per page. We will discuss optimal means of taking notes on readings on the first day of class.

Late Assignments

All times in this syllabus are in Eastern Time, but for any of you in other time zones, I am willing to work with you to ensure that paper deadlines occur at a reasonable hour—just send me an email if you think the deadlines will be an issue. Given the state of affairs, I am going to be very lenient with late assignments this semester. You can consider the deadlines listed here to be suggestions designed to keep you on track and to prevent work from piling up. I will only deduct

points from papers submitted after 5 PM on April 29. Any papers/projects submit after that will automatically lose 20 points. If you submit your paper less than 48 hours before the grade submission deadline (5 PM on May 3), I may not have time to grade your paper and may mark it as “Incomplete” until I can get to it.

Grading

Grades will be based on the merit of your work and your demonstrated mastery of the material. There is no grading “curve” employed in this class. Your final grade will be calculated as follows:

Participation (General)	30%
Participation (First Mover)	15%
Reading Response #1	5%
Reading Response #2	5%
Literature Review	15%
Final Paper/Project	30%

I will grade each of the above requirements on the following scale:

100 to 95	A	74 to 71	C
94 to 91	A-	70 to 67	C-
90 to 87	B+	66 to 63	D+
86 to 83	B	62 to 59	D
82 to 79	B-	58 to 55	D-
78 to 75	C+	Below 55	F

An “A” grade means that you have demonstrated a genuinely superior level of understanding of the subject and have provided ample evidence of that insight. I will round up for grades at or above *N.5*, and I will discuss grading standards further in announcements via Canvas.

Assignment Feedback

I aim to provide grades and feedback within two weeks of the submission of each piece, and I will provide all feedback on the Canvas course page. If at any point you would like to know if your participation has been satisfactory—or if you would like additional feedback on papers beyond what I provide on Canvas—please email me or come to office hours to ask for more detail.

Grade Disputes

You are entitled to a satisfactory explanation for why you received the grade you did. If you are not satisfied with the explanation I provide via Canvas, then you should meet with me in office hours. If, after further discussion, you remain unsatisfied with your grade, you may request that I regrade the assignment, and you should provide a brief (1- or 2-paragraph) explanation as to why you believe your initial grade should be raised. When you request that I regrade an assignment, I may ultimately issue a grade that is better, the same, or worse than the original. You may also appeal your final grade on the grounds of a mathematical error, error in grading procedures, or inequity in the application of policies stated in this syllabus.

Part I. Introduction

Monday, January 11 / Wednesday, January 13 / Friday, January 15

Thinking about U.S. National Security

- Amelia Hoover Green, “How to Read Political Science: A Guide in Four Steps” (2013).
- Jacob Poushter, “Foreign Policy Experts in the U.S. Have Much Different Views about the Threats to the Country than the General Public,” *Pew Research Center* ([October 23, 2020](#)).
- Arnold Wolfers, “‘National Security’ as an Ambiguous Symbol,” *Political Science Quarterly* Vol. 67, No. 4. (1952): 481-502.
- **Recommended:** William Strunk, Jr. and E.B. White, “Elementary Principles of Composition,” in *The Elements of Style* (2000 [[1918](#)], Macmillan Publishing Co.)

Wednesday, January 20 / Friday, January 22

Defining U.S. National Security

- David A. Baldwin, “The Concept of Security,” *Review of International Studies* Vol. 23, No. 1 (1997): 5-26
- Melvyn P. Leffler, “National Security,” *The Journal of American History* Vol. 77, No. 1 (1990): 143-152.

***Monday, January 18 – Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day**

Part II. Actors and Tools

Monday, January 25 / Wednesday, January 27 / Friday, January 29*

The Domestic Political System and U.S. National Security

- David R. Segal, “National Security and Democracy in the United States,” *Armed Forces & Society* Vol. 20, No. 3 (1994): 375-393.
- Matthew A. Baum and Philip B.K. Potter, “Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy in the Age of Social Media,” *Journal of Politics* Vol. 81, No. 2 (2019): 747-756.
- Paul Musgrave, “International Hegemony Meets Domestic Politics: Why Liberals Can Be Pessimists,” *Security Studies* (2019): 1-28.
- **Recommended:** Rogers M. Smith, “Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America,” *The American Political Science Review* Vol. 87, No. 3 (1993): 549-566.

*Guest Talk: Dr. Paul Musgrave, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Monday, February 1 / Wednesday, February 3 / Friday, February 5*

Individual Leaders

- Robert Jervis, “Hypotheses on Misperception,” *World Politics* Vol. 20, No. 3 (1968):454-479.
- Yuen Foong Khong, *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965* (Princeton University Press, 1992): Excerpts as assigned.

- Alexandra T. Evans and A. Bradley Potter, “When Do Leaders Change Course? Theories of Success and the American Withdrawal from Beirut, 1983-1984,” *Texas National Security Review* Vol. 2, No. 2 (2019): 10-38.
- **Recommended:** Alexandra Guisinger and Elizabeth N. Saunders, “Mapping the Boundaries of Elite Cues: How Elites Shape Mass Opinion across International Issues,” *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 61, No. 2 (2017): 425-441.

*Guest Talk: Mr. A. Bradley Potter, Stanton Visiting Scientist, Eisenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies at the U.S. Air Force Academy; Ph.D. candidate in Strategic Studies, Johns Hopkins University-SAIS.

Monday, February 8 / Wednesday, February 10 / Friday, February 12*

Bureaucratic Politics

- Jonathon Bendor and Thomas Hammond, “Rethinking Allison’s Models,” *American Political Science Review* Vol. 86, No. 2 (1992): 301-322.
- Amy B. Zegart, “An Empirical Analysis of Failed Intelligence Reforms before September 11,” *Political Science Quarterly* Vol. 121, No. 1 (2006): 33-60.
- David A. Cooper, Nikolas K. Gvosdev, and Jessica D. Blankshain, “Deconstructing the ‘Deep State’: Subordinate Bureaucratic Politics in U.S. National Security,” *Orbis* Vol. 62, No. 4 (2018): 518-540.
- **Recommended:** John P. Burke, “The Neutral/Honest Broker Role in Foreign Policy Decision Making: A Reassessment.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 2 (2005):229-257.

*Guest Talk: Details TBA

Monday, February 15 / Wednesday, February 17 / Friday, February 19*

Congress

- Douglas T. Stuart, “Ministry of Fear: The 1947 National Security Act in Historical and Institutional Context,” *International Studies Perspectives* Vol. 4, No. 3 (2003): 293-313.
- William Howell and Jon Pevehouse, “Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force,” *International Organization* Vol. 59, No. 1 (2005): 209-232.
- Linda L. Fowler, “The Long Decline of Congressional Oversight,” *Foreign Affairs* (2018).
- **Recommended:** Matthew D. McCubbins and Thomas Schwartz, “Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms,” *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 28, No. 1 (1984): 165-179.

*Guest Talk: Dr. Linda L. Fowler, Professor of Government and Frank J. Reagan Chair in Policy Studies, Emerita, Dartmouth College.

Monday, February 22 / Wednesday, February 24 / Friday, February 26*

The Military

- Harvey Sapolsky, Eugene Gholz, and Caitlin Talmadge, *US Defense Politics: The Origins of Security Policy* (Routledge, 2008): 96-109.

- Robert L. Paarlberg, “Knowledge as Power: Science, Military Dominance, and U.S. Security,” *International Security* Vol. 29, No. 1 (2004): 122-151.
- Risa Brooks, “Paradoxes of Professionalism: Rethinking Civil-Military Relations in the United States,” *International Security* Vol. 44, No. 4 (2020): 7-44.

*Guest Talk: Details TBA.

Monday, March 1 / Wednesday, March 3 / Friday, March 5*

Diplomacy and Alliances

- Duncan L. Clarke, “Why State Can’t Lead,” *Foreign Policy* Vol. 66 (1987): 128-142.
- Lisa L. Martin, “The President and International Commitments: Treaties as Signaling Devices,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 3 (2005): 440-465.
- Marina E. Henke, “The Politics of Diplomacy: How the United States Builds Multilateral Military Coalitions,” *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 61, No. 2 (2017): 410–424.
- **Recommended:** Brett Ashley Leeds and Michaela Mattes, “Alliance Politics during the Cold War: Aberration, New World Order, or Continuation of History?,” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* Vol. 24, No. 3 (2007): 183-199.

*Guest Talk: Details TBA.

Monday, March 15 / Wednesday, March 17 / Friday, March 19*

Economic Tools

- Carla Norrlof, “Dollar Hegemony: A Power Analysis,” *Review of International Political Economy* Vol. 21, No. 5 (2014): 1,042-1,070.
- Audie Klotz, “Norms Reconstituting Interests: Global Racial Equality and US Sanctions against South Africa,” *International Organization* Vol. 49, No. 3 (1995): 451-478.
- Helen V. Milner and Dustin H. Tingley, “The Political Economy of US Foreign Aid: American Legislators and the Domestic Politics of Aid.” *Economics & Politics* Vol. 22, No. 2 (2010): 200-232.
- **Recommended:** Gustavo A. Flores-Macías and Sarah E. Kreps, “Political Parties at War: A Study of American War Finance, 1789-2010,” *American Political Science Review* Vol. 107, No. 4 (2013): 833-848.

*Guest Talk: Details TBA.

Part III – Contemporary Issues

Monday, March 8 / Wednesday, March 10 / Friday, March 12*

China and U.S. National Security

- Kurt Campbell and Ely Ratner, “The China Reckoning,” *Foreign Affairs* ([March/April 2018](#)).
- Michael McFaul, “Cold War Lessons and Fallacies for US-China Relations Today,” *The Washington Quarterly* Vol. 43, No. 4 (2020): 7-39.

- Fiona S. Cunningham and M. Taylor Fravel, “Assuring Assured Retaliation: China's Nuclear Posture and U.S.-China Strategic Stability,” *International Security* Vol. 40, No. 2 (2015): 7-50.
- **Recommended:** Frank L. Smith, III, “Quantum Technology Hype and National Security,” *Security Dialogue* Vol. 51, No. 5 (2020): 499-516.

*Guest Talk: Details TBA.

Monday, March 22 / Friday, March 26

Climate Change

- Joshua W. Busby, “Who Cares about the Weather?: Climate Change and U.S. National Security,” *Security Studies* Vol. 17, No. 3 (2008): 468-504.
- Jeff D. Colgan, “Climate Change and the Politics of Military Bases,” *Global Environmental Politics* Vol. 18, No. 1 (2018): 33-51.

*Wednesday, March 24 – University reading day

Monday, March 29 / Wednesday, March 31* / Friday April 2

Regime Change and Democracy Promotion

- Alexander B. Downes and Jonathan Monten, “Forced to Be Free?: Why Foreign-Imposed Regime Change Rarely Leads to Democratization,” *International Security* Vol. 37, No. 4 (2013): 90-131.
- Paul Poast and Alexandra Chinchilla, “Good for Democracy? Evidence from the 2004 NATO Expansion,” *International Politics* Vol. 57 (2020): 47-490.
- Lindsey A. O’Rourke, “The Strategic Logic of Covert Regime Change: US-Backed Regime Change Campaigns during the Cold War,” *Security Studies* Vol. 29, No. 1 (2020): 92-217.
- **Recommended:** Michael Poznansky, “Feigning Compliance: Covert Action and International Law,” *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 63, No. 1 (2019): 72-84.

*Guest Talk: Ms. Alexandra Chinchilla, USIP-Minerva Peace and Security Scholar; Ph.D. candidate in Political Science, University of Chicago.

Monday, April 5 / Wednesday, April 7 / Friday, April 9*

Nuclear Weapons in U.S. National Security

- Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press, “The New Era of Counterforce: Technological Change and the Future of Nuclear Deterrence,” *International Security* Vol. 41, No. 4 (2017): 9-49.
- Ryan Snyder, Benoît Pelopidas, Keir A. Lieber, and Daryl G. Press, “Correspondence: New Era or New Error? Technology and the Future of Deterrence,” *International Security* Vol. 43, No. 3 (2018/19): 190-193.
- Nina Tannenwald, “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the normative basis of nuclear non-use.” *International Organization* 53.03 (1999): 433-468.
- So Jin Lee, “Deterrable or Committed Signalers? Assessing the Effectiveness of Aid in Nuclear Nonproliferation,” (working paper).

- **Recommended:** Neil Narang and Rupal N. Mehta, “The Unforeseen Consequences of Extended Deterrence: Moral Hazard in a Nuclear Client State,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* Vol. 63, No. 1 (2019): 218-250.

*Guest Talk: Ms. So Jin Lee, Predoctoral Fellow, Johns Hopkins University-SAIS; Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science, Duke University.

Monday, April 12 / Wednesday, April 14 / Friday, April 16*

Cyberspace & Emerging Technologies

- Benjamin Jensen, Brandon Valeriano, and Ryan Maness, “Fancy Bears and Digital Trolls: Cyber Strategy with a Russian Twist,” *Journal of Strategic Studies* Vol. 42, No. 2 (2019): 212-234.
- Jon R. Lindsay, “Demystifying the Quantum Threat: Infrastructure, Institutions, and Intelligence Advantage,” *Security Studies* Vol. 29, No. 2 (2020): 335-361.
- Joan Johnson-Freese and David Burbach, “The Outer Space Treaty and the Weaponization of Space,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* Vol. 75, No. 4 (2019): 137-141.

*Guest Talk: Details TBA.

Part IV - Conclusion

Monday, April 19 / Wednesday, April 21

The Future of U.S. National Security

- Kathleen H. Hicks, “Could the Pandemic Reshape World Order, American Security, and National Defense?,” in Hal Brands and Francis J. Gavin (eds.), *COVID-19 and World Order* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2020): 348-365.
- **Recommended:** Frank Hoffman, “National Security in the Post-Pandemic Era,” *Orbis* (2020): 1-29.

***Thursday, April 22 – Tuesday, April 27 – Exam period**