



DSS 5312
Strategic Survey of Europe
Sergeants Major Academy, Ft. Bliss

Spring 2016 (Jan. 19—Mar. 5)
Monday: 5:00–8:00 p.m.

Instructor

Professor: Dr. Christopher Linebarger

Email: cdlinebarger@utep.edu

Course Website: <https://blackboardlearn.utep.edu/> or <https://my.utep.edu/>

Alternate Course Website: <http://clinebarger.weebly.com/dss-5312.html>

Phone: 915.747.6981

Office: Kelly Hall 219

Office Hours: Open door, or by appt.

Description

Europe has historically been the central stage upon which the dramas of international relations have played. Though the United States sought to remain isolated from these dramas in the first 150 years of its existence, American interests were drawn inexorably onto the continent by the facts of war, peace, and economic globalization. It is therefore of paramount importance for the student of strategic affairs to have a solid grasp on European and Transatlantic relations.

The purpose of this graduate seminar to provide students with a brief, yet intensive introduction to the international politics and foreign policies of the region's main actors. An emphasis will be placed on the NATO alliance over the years, and the role it has played in

shaping Transatlantic security. Organizationally, the class will first cover the relevance of Europe to the global system of states. This will be followed by an exploration of theories of International Relations (IR) and how they explain European security. We will conclude the class by examining ethno-nationalism, as well as the sources of Russian foreign policy.

Required Course Materials

There are no required text books for this course. The entirety of the readings consist in articles from academic and policy journals, and can be found on the course website. These are listed on the course calendar below.

Assignments & Expectations

Participation (15% of grade). All students are expected to come to each class meeting prepared to discuss the readings and the lectures. This will involve spending the time to read each item on the reading list, and thinking about what each contributes to the topic. Discussion each week will focus on such issues as arguments being made by the readings, and your own informed thoughts and opinions on the topic.

Presentation (25% of grade). Beyond the regular class attendance and active participation in class discussion, each student is expected to make one presentation to the rest of the class, which should be about 15 minutes in length. Students are encouraged to make use of PowerPoint or other visual aids. These presentations will begin on the second week of the course. The presentations should address the main points made in the required readings, and pose questions that will stimulate discussion. The presentations will be evaluated on their substantive content and form.

The following general grading scale will be used for assessing participation and presentations:

- A: The student made a very strong contribution to the course. Class discussion, comments, and/or presentations reflected a great deal of thought about the material, and were constructive (for example, not only identifying current weaknesses and showing how these weaknesses limit the current literature, but suggesting useful future directions that could help to overcome these weaknesses or to extend the literature in important ways)
- B: The student contributed meaningfully to the course. Class participation and/or presentations went beyond repeating the assigned material, perhaps identifying weaknesses in the current literature, but did not make many constructive suggestions about how these weaknesses might be overcome or how the literature might usefully be extended in the future.
- C or below: The student did not contribute meaningfully. Class participation and/or presentations were limited to repeating the assigned material rather than making connections or extensions, or was filled with mistakes and inaccuracies.

- F: The student was a net drain on the course, rarely if ever speaking in class or failing to make the required number of presentations.

Movie Review (2 pages, 25%). In addition, students will write review of a movie that examines a topic of the student's interest and that relates to the themes of the class. Students are free to select any movie they wish, so long as it pertains to European security and the topic(s) of the course. The review should be written in 12 point font, double-spaced, with one inch margins, and in the standard fonts. The review *should not* be a typical "Hollywood" review in which acting, plot, etc. are criticized. Rather, students should endeavor to explain whether the movie accurately portrays the themes and topics covered in class. Each student will briefly discuss their review on on the day that it is due. This talk should be about 5–10 minutes in length. PowerPoint slides are not necessary.

You are free to choose any movie related to European security, but here are some suggestions (in no particular order):

Movies / Documentaries:

- Tinker Tailor Soldier Spy
- The Hunt for Red October
- The Mouse That Roared
- The Battle of Algiers
- The Wind that Shakes the Barley
- Romeo and Juliet in Sarajevo (PBS)
- Wag the Dog

Research Paper (8-10 pages, 35%)

Students will write a research paper (8–10 double-spaced pages) that examines a topic of the student's interest relating to the themes of the class. Students are free to pick any subject they wish, so long as it pertains to European security, and are encouraged to consult with the professor when choosing a topic and developing their paper. The paper should be written in 12 point font, with one inch margins, and in the standard fonts. The paper should be analytical; that is to say, it should identify a problem related to European security, situate the problem within context, offer objective analysis, explanation, or prediction, and offer a solution to the issue under analysis. The paper should not simply be a descriptive or journalistic account of events, it should make use of academic and/or policy relevant sources, and must include a bibliography. The paper is due at the start of our final class session. Citations should be parenthetical.

Your paper will be graded according to the following criteria:

- **Argument:** Stated in introduction? Convincing? Original?
- **Analysis:** Critical discussion/evaluation of facts? Conclusions logical?

- **Coherence:** Line of argumentation? Contradictions? Terms used consistently?
- **Structure:** Is the essay structured? Logical Structure? Systematic approach?
- **Research:** Enough relevant sources? Quality of sources? Primary sources?
- **Language and form:** Grammar/punctuation? Page numbers? Paragraphs? Referencing? Bibliography? Respecting page-count?

Grades

Grades are assigned according to the following scale:

| Letter Grade | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|
| A | 90–100% |
| B | 80–89% |
| C | 70–79% |
| D | 60–69% |
| F | 0–59% |

Disabilities Statement

I will make any reasonable accommodations for students with limitations due to disabilities. Please send me an email or call me before or after class in the first two weeks to discuss any special needs you might have. If you have a documented disability and require specific accommodations, you will need to contact the Center for Accommodations and Support Services (CASS) in the East Union Bldg., Room 106 within the first two weeks of classes. CASS can also be reaching in the following ways:

Web: <http://sa.utep.edu/cass/>

Phone: (915) 745-5148

Fax: (915) 747- 8712

Email: <mailto:cass@utep.edu>

Plagiarism and Academic Dishonesty Statement

Cheating is unethical and not acceptable. Plagiarism is using information or original wording in a paper without giving credit to the source of that information or wording: it is also not acceptable. Do not submit work under your name that you did not do yourself. You may not submit work for this class that you did for another class. If you are found to be cheating or plagiarizing, you will be subject to disciplinary action, per UTEP catalog policy. Refer to: <http://www.utep.edu/dos/academic.htm> for further information.

Course Calendar & Assigned Readings

The following calendar is only a guide. Any changes will be announced in-class well ahead of time. It is your responsibility to keep up to date with any schedule alterations.

The recommended readings are not required for the class. They are listed simply to provide additional context, to suggest material that could be useful for writing your papers, and to provide you with direction if a particular topic interests you enough to pursue it in the future.

Week 1 — January 18: Introduction

Because of a Federal Holiday (Martin Luther King, Jr. Day), there is no scheduled class for this week. As such, there will be no lecture or slides accompanying this week's topic. Instead, I ask that students read the Kagan article listed under "required readings." Kagan wrote the assigned piece in 2002, just after 9/11 and in the run-up to the Iraq War. It captures the spirit of those times, and it was very important in shaping the opinion of policy-makers. Do you agree or disagree with Kagan? How well do you think his argument has held up since 2002? Are Europeans and Americans really as different as Kagan supposes (or, as Kagan puts it, are Americans from Mars and Europeans from Venus)?

Required readings:

- Robert Kagan. 2002. "Power and Weakness." *Policy Review* 113(1): 3–28.

Recommended readings:

- Marc Trachtenberg. 1999. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963*. Princeton University Press.
- Victoria de Grazia. 2005. *Irresistible Empire: America's Advance Through Twentieth-Century Europe*. Belknap Press.
- Robert Kagan. 2003. *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Philip H. Gordon and Jeremy Shapiro. 2004. *Allies at War: America, Europe, and the Crisis Over Iraq*. McGraw Hill.

Week 2 — January 25: Historical Background of Europe & Contemporary Security Issues

This week's readings entail an overview of current affairs in Europe. Lecture will introduce European security, provide historical background and the necessary context to discuss these current affairs.

Required readings:

- Strategic Survey: Europe

Recommended readings:

- Dan Byman and Jeremy Shapiro. Autumn 2006. "Bridging the Transatlantic Counterterrorism Gap," *The Washington Quarterly* 29(4): 33-50.
- Roy Oliver. 2003. "EuroIslam: The Jihad Within?" *The National Interest* 71: 63-73.
- Renee de Nevers. 2007. "NATO's International Security Role in the Terrorist Era" *International Security*. 31(4): 34-66.
- Sebastian Rosato. 2011. "Europe's Troubles: Power Politics and the State of the European Project." *International Security* 35(4): 45-86.
- David J. Kilcullen. 2007. "Subversion and Counter-subversion in the Campaign against Terrorism in Europe." *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 30(8): 647-666.

Week 3 — February 1: Realist Theories; The Cold War in Europe and the History of NATO

In this week, we will cover the basics of power-politics and their implications for international security. Although realist theories are not specific to Europe, they were originally devised to explain the patterns of war and peace on the continent. With that foundation, we will apply realist thought to the Cold War and the development of NATO.

Required readings:

- George Kennan. 1946. "The Long Telegram." Available online: <http://www.ntanet.net/KENNAN.html>

Recommended readings:

- Stephen M. Walt. 1985. "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power." *International Security*. 9(4): 3–48.
- NSC 68. 1950. "United States Objectives and Programs for National Security." Available online: <http://fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsc-hst/nsc-68-4.htm>
- Christopher Clark. 2012. *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe Went to War in 1914*. Harper Perennial.
- Barbara Tuchman. 1962. *The Guns of August*. Random House.
- Hans J. Morgenthau. 1948. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Peace and Power*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Kenneth Waltz. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill.

Week 4 — February 8: Liberal Theories; European Integration and the Post-Cold War Order

The 20th Century saw an attempt by the European nation-states to overcome the power-politics of the past with the construction of an integrated system of politics and economics. We will therefore examine the second major branch of international relations theory (liberalism), and apply it to the post-Cold War era.

Required readings:

- Michael E. Smith. 2011. "A Liberal Grand Strategy in a Realist World?: Power, Purpose, and the EU's Changing Global Role." *Journal of European Public Policy* 18(2): 144-63.

Recommended readings:

- Jolyon Howorth and Anand Menon. 2009. "Still Not Pushing Back. Why the European Union Is Not Balancing the United States." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53(5): 727–744.
- Seth Jones and Stephen Larrabee. 2005/2006. "Arming Europe." *The National Interest*.

Available at: http://www.rand.org/pubs/reprints/2006/RAND_RP1209.pdf

- Charles A. Kupchan and Clifford A. Kupchan. 1991. "Concerts, Collective Security, and the Future of Europe." *International Security* 16(1): 114–116.
- Robert O. Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Andrew Moravcsik. 1998. *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*. Routledge.
- Seth G. Jones. 2007. *The Rise of European Security Cooperation*. Cambridge University Press.

MOVIE REVIEW DUE; PRESENT MOVIE REVIEW

Week 5 — February 15: Nationalism and Ethnic Politics in Europe (I)

This class is scheduled to occur on President's Day. As such, we will not hold class at the regularly scheduled place and time. Instead, the assignment for this week is to read the Mueller piece and then come prepared to talk about it on the next class. Mueller's argument is highly controversial, and it represents an alternative view of ethno-nationalism that is not often given credence by media, policy-makers, or the general public. Do you agree with Mueller's view? Why or why not? It is my intention to set up a discussion of ethnicity and nationalism in the subsequent class session (February 22).

Required readings:

- John Mueller. 2000. "The Banality of Ethnic War." *International Security* 25(1): 42-70.

Recommended readings:

- Donald L. Horowitz. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. University of California Press.
- Ernest Gellner. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press.
- Benedict Anderson. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Revised Edition*. Verso.

Week 6 — February 22: Nationalism and Ethnic Politics (II); The Balkan Wars and Ethnic Conflict in Eastern Europe

In this session, we will examine the causes, consequences, and history of ethno-nationalism in Europe. We will consider where ethnicities come from, how they interact with states and governments, the phenomenon of nationalism, and some of the reasons for ethnic conflict. We will then apply this foundation to the conflicts in the Balkans and Eastern Europe.

Required readings:

- David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild. 1996. "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security*.

Recommended readings:

- Chaim Kaufman. 1996. "Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars." *International Security* 20(4): 136-175.
- Barry Posen. 1993. "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict." *Survival* 35(1): 27-47.
- James Fearon and David Laitin. "Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity." *International Organization* 54(4): 845-877.
- David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild (eds.). 1998. *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict: Fear, Diffusion, and Escalation*. Princeton University Press.

Week 7 — February 29: The Domestic Sources of International Politics; Russia's Recent Foreign-Policy

At the conclusion of our class, we will explore some of the ways domestic political forces impact international security. This logic will then be applied to Russia, and we will take a look at post-Cold War Russian history.

Required readings:

- David Remnick. August 11, 2014. "Watching the Eclipse." *The New Yorker*.
<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/08/11/watching-eclipse>

Recommended readings:

- David E. Hoffman. 2001. *The Oligarchs: Wealth and Power in the New Russia*. PublicAffairs.
- Charles Kupchan. May/June 2010. "NATO's Final Frontier." *Foreign Affairs* 89(3).
- Thomas Ambrosio. 2009. *Authoritarian Backlash: Russian Resistance to Democratization in the Former Soviet Union*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

RESEARCH PAPER DUE

This syllabus is a guideline and is subject to change.
UPDATED: January 25, 2016